

THE  
ECLECTIC REVIEW,  
FOR MARCH, 1834.

---

Art. I. 1. *Thoughts on the Separation of Church and State.* By the Rev. Edward Burton, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. 8vo. pp. 87. London. 1834.

2. *A Letter to the Members of Both Houses of Parliament, on the Dissenters' Petitions, and on Church Grievances.* By a late Fellow of All-Souls College, Oxford. 8vo. pp. 56. London. 1834.

3. *Church and State in America.* Inscribed to the Bishop of London. By C. Colton. 8vo. pp. 64. London. 1834.

DR. BURTON is a man of war; the Goliath of Oxford. He speared Mr. Bulteel, and did fierce battle against Lord Henley. He is the chosen champion of the Church against the Reformers within her pale, and now he comes forward to defy all enemies without the gates. But, disdaining to fight with pygmies, he passes by the Dissenters with brief and haughty notice, and, advancing to the threshold of the senate, there sounds his challenge in the ears of the British Parliament, telling the Commons of England at their peril to meddle with the Church. 'Parliament', says the Regius Professor of Oxford, 'has now no constitutional right to legislate for the Church of England.' The union between Church and State, on which that right was founded, has been dissolved !

'If the House of Commons should undertake to alter the Liturgy, and if a Prayer-book thus made for the use of the Church of England should be sanctioned by an Act of Parliament, I state candidly and openly, that I shall not use it, unless my Diocesan should order me. *There is no power in the State to make me use it.* The Act itself would be null, a mere piece of waste paper. And if all members bring forward the motions for which they have given notice, the next session will perhaps produce many such sheets of waste paper, printed at the expense of the country. Thus Mr. Faithful, who is a Dissenter, and who is not reported to have blushed when he said, "I hate the Establishment", has given notice of two motions; one, for a Bill to regu-

late and render more equal the incomes of the Bishops ; the other, to do the same for the Clergy. If these Bills should in the slightest degree affect the spiritual duties of the Bishops, *Parliament, as at present constituted, has no power to pass them.* Neither are the incomes of the Bishops under the control of the *present* parliament, (though they may have been so formerly,) unless the principle is established, that the incomes of all ministers of religion are under the control of Parliament. I wholly deny that the Church of England has any precriptive or exclusive right to be pillaged.' pp. 63, 4.

This is magnificent blustering. But let us suppose the case, (a case we admit to be neither very probable nor desirable,) that a new Prayer-book, prepared by a Parliamentary Commission, should be, by Act of Parliament, appointed to be read in churches, such Act having obtained the royal assent ; and suppose that Dr. Burton's diocesan *should* order him to use it : what then ? Of course, he would obey his diocesan, and there would be an end of the matter. But what if his diocesan should refuse to give effect to an act of the Legislature, sanctioned by the Head of the Church ? There *have been* deprivations, and those were in the palmy days of the Church. Dr. Burton will recollect the admonitory remark of the Virgin Queen : ' The power that made, can unmake.' We might then have, again, bishops and *ex*-bishops, as in the days of the non-jurors. Will Dr. Burton say, that, even if a time-serving diocesan, some Whig or liberal bishop, should order him to use the new liturgy, still he would not use it ? Then, indeed, we should honour the fearless consistency of this bold churchman. But in what predicament would he then find himself ? Just where two thousand clergymen found themselves on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1662 !—He would be a Nonconformist, a Dissenter.

We did not expect to be furnished by the Oxford Regius Professor with so direct a defence of nonconformity. It is true, that he carries his notions of obedience to his diocesan further than did those good clergymen who were ejected by the Act of Uniformity ; but the principle of conscientious resistance to illegal usurpation is the same, whether the usurping power be temporal or spiritual, a convocation or a parliament. We can scarcely imagine that there is more virtue in resisting an Act of Parliament, than in disobeying a canon or a rubric. Dr. Burton takes higher ground than the Nonconformists ventured to do. He calls in question the validity of a decision of the Legislature, till endorsed by the Church. He must consult his diocesan before he can determine whether he is to obey those other powers that be, the King, Lords, and Commons of the realm. This is a noble height of clerical independence, worthy of the times when a cardinal was a match for a king ; *Ego et rex mens.* Actuated by the same noble spirit, when the English Prayer-book was first

substituted by authority for the Latin Mass-book, there were many Dr. Burtons who said, ‘*I shall not use it*: there is no ‘power in the State to make me use it.’ And so they kept to their paternoster, but lost their benefices. The State could not make Dr. Burton use a new Prayer-book; but it could determine who should be Canon of Christ Church.

No such trial of faith and consistency, we trust, awaits the learned Professor. We should be very sorry, were Parliament to meddle with the Prayer-book at all. It seems, however, that Parliament have lost the power, since the repeal of the Test-Act, of regulating any ecclesiastical matters. ‘The only principle on ‘which Parliament could legislate at all for the Church of ‘England, was’, Dr. B. contends, ‘because the lay members of ‘that Church were represented in Parliament: but this principle ‘can only be allowed, when the persons who vote upon such ‘questions in Parliament, are also members of the Church of ‘England.’ Surely, however, this is a very palpable *non sequitur*. Dr. Burton meant perhaps to say, only when *all* the persons who vote are also members of the Church of England. But did this condition ever exist in fact? Were there not always members sitting in the House of Commons, who were not members of the Church of England,—either Roman Catholics or Protestant Dissenters? What was Alderman Love, who, in the name of the Dissenters, gave his concurrence in passing the Test Act, to avert the apprehended danger from the Popish party? It is notorious that Dissenters have always sat in Parliament; and the lay members of the Church are just as much represented there as they ever were. If the principle for which he contends, was ever a warrant for such legislation, it is valid still. The Scottish Union let in a number of Presbyterians of the Established Church of Scotland; but we heard nothing of Parliament’s becoming thereby incapacitated for any of its previous functions. The number of Roman Catholic and Dissenting members may have been increased by the Reform Bill; but this can make no difference in the *principle*, as it regards the constitutional powers of Parliament. It were indeed passing strange that the British Parliament should thus unwittingly have abdicated its legislative sovereignty,—should have unconsciously deprived itself of the power to legislate for a portion of the nation, because it had come to represent the whole. Yet, such is the discovery of Dr. Burton! Parliament never intended to part with its power, but a thing called a principle has stolen it away, and transferred it to the Church. Such a thievish principle as this must be a very bad principle; and if the Church is the receiver of stolen power, she must be adjudged *particeps criminis*.

But Dr. Burton would probably take a distinction between the power *de jure* and the power *de facto*. The present House

of Commons have shewn that they had the power to pass a bill for consolidating certain of the Irish bishoprics; and the House of Lords, after a little ado, passed the same bill; and the royal assent being thereto given, the said bill became law. Still, Dr. Burton would say, that King, Lords, and Commons had no power to do this, because it was against *his* principle. That is to say, ‘the clergy, almost to a man, were opposed to the abolition.’ The will of parliament is only the power *de facto*, while the will of the clergy is the power *de jure*; *ergo*, the Parliament is a usurper. This will appear the more clear, when it is considered, how spiritual a thing a bishopric is.

‘Is it not the office of a bishop to watch over the souls of men? *And may not souls be lost by a bishop not being able to attend to his spiritual concerns?* The question, therefore, *of the number of bishops which are necessary to watch over the souls of men, is entirely and absolutely a spiritual question.*’

Very true; and only think of the dreadful consequences of calling away these holy watchmen from their spiritual concerns, to attend levees, and mingle in the strife of political faction. How can the Bishop of Exeter be watching over souls in Devonshire, while he is heading a parliamentary diversion in favour of Don Miguel in London? Or how can Dr. Carey be keeping his sheep on the Welsh mountains, while watching for other things in Westminster? If souls may be lost through reducing the number of bishops, they must be endangered equally by the non-residence of bishops, since *de non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio*. But the subject is too grave, too awful for badinage; and we feel to have been betrayed by Dr. Burton’s lamentably inapposite use of Scripture, into a levity bordering upon profaneness. The office of a bishop to watch over souls! Such is, indeed, the office of a Christian pastor, who feeds his sheep as well as partakes of the fleece; who preaches the word, and visits the poor and the afflicted, and acts as a spiritual overseer of his charge. And we nonconformists think that such a pastor is a true scriptural bishop. But a diocesan cannot be such a bishop, nor can a lord-bishop be such a pastor. Applied to such a dignitary, the apostolic designation sounds like irony or sarcasm; and to speak of souls being lost through the suppression of a decayed see without a population, might be mistaken for what Dr. Burton would shudder at—gross impiety.

Spiritual as is the office of a bishop, so that even his barony is a spiritual thing, and his votes in parliament are all spiritual, still, the revenue of an episcopal see, Dr. Burton admits to be of a temporal nature. With this, therefore, Parliament might be thought competent to deal. Not so, contends this champion of the Church.

‘ The amount of their incomes may be called a temporal question, though that is intimately mixed up with the discharge of their spiritual duties: and when bishops receive nothing from the country, but possess estates which were originally bequeathed voluntarily by the owners, the amount of their incomes is a question of internal arrangement in the Church itself. Would Roman Catholics allow the number of Roman Catholic Bishops to be settled by Parliament? Would Wesleyans and Independents allow the number of their Ministers to be settled by Parliament? These cases are precisely the same with that of the Church of England. The Wesleyans and Independents have never consented that members of the Church of England should legislate for their body: neither has the Church of England ever consented that Wesleyans and Independents, or Roman Catholics, or Unitarians, should legislate for the Church of England. Why is an illegal usurpation tolerated in one case, which would not be tolerated in the others?

‘ I contend, that the Irish Church was not bound to comply with the provisions of this unrighteous Bill. If the Clergy of the diocese of Waterford had elected a Bishop according to the forms of the primitive Church, and if the Primate of Ireland had thought fit to consecrate him, he would have been as much a Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland, as any of the Bishops appointed by the Crown. But Roman Catholics and Dissenters have decided it to be convenient, that the Irish Church should henceforth have fewer Bishops: and thus the Church, in the language of Mr. Binney, is “bound and fettered and enslaved.” But will she not burst her bonds? Will not her clergy rise from one end of the country to the other, and tell the Legislature, in a voice which cannot be mistaken, that they will not allow Dissenters from her creed, to dictate to her in matters of religion? How long shall our modern Uzzahs be allowed to lay their unhallowed hands upon the ark of our Zion? It is time to assert our rights. It is time to act upon the principles which Dissenters have so ably vindicated, to demand a liberty of conscience, and the power of legislating for ourselves.’ pp. 61, 62.

The time to act upon these principles will come; but we do not think, with Dr. Burton, that it is come just at present. That the clergy have not the liberty of conscience which they ought to have, we freely concede; and we should be rejoiced to see the Church placed in that independent position which would enable her members to decide for themselves, whether they should have four and twenty or four score bishops, and to choose who those bishops should be, without a *congè d'élire*. But things are not, as yet, ripe for the emancipation of the Church. The case of the Wesleyans and Independents, and that of the Church of England, are not at present precisely the same. The ministers of Dissenting communities are chosen by the people, because the people support them; and their number is not settled by Parliament, because they sustain no civil capacity which connects them with the State. If the Church of England should be pleased to mul-

tiply the number of its bishops in Scotland, we do not think that Parliament would interfere to prevent it; but episcopal baronies dependent on royal nomination, must, we submit, remain among the things which belong to Cæsar. They concern the crown; and what concerns the crown has, in modern days, been deemed fit subject for parliamentary regulation. Roman Catholics have been obliged, indeed, to allow the number of their bishops to be settled by other than ecclesiastical authorities in many instances; for Catholic sovereigns have never shewn any remarkable tenderness of conscience on this score. And long before Earl Grey's ministry, the Protestant Church of Ireland meekly submitted to have her sees united by Parliament, without a word of complaint or a sign of displeasure.

But when Dr. Burton affirms, that the Wesleyans and Independents have never consented that members of the Church of England should legislate for their body, he forgets himself most prodigiously. It is true, that their consent was not asked by those churchmen who undertook to legislate for them; but he cannot mean to avail himself of a quibble. Parliament, in those days of its ecclesiastical purity, when it most truly represented the Church, took the shortest way of settling for Dissenters the number of their ministers, by determining that they should have none. All who presumed to act in that capacity were sent to gaol. We are indebted to the Church of England legislation for the Pilgrim's Progress, for it was written in prison; and there also the admirable Baxter found leisure to compose some of his voluminous works. But, not to dwell on those days, Parliament, having at length consented that the sectaries should be allowed to have their ministers, if they would be so absurd as to maintain them, deemed it necessary to settle what they should teach; and therefore bound them in thirty-six articles and a half and sundry declarations, to keep the unity of the faith, before they were entrusted with a parliamentary license to preach the Gospel in certain duly registered places of assembly. Now all this appears to us precisely that sort of legislating for Dissenters which Dr. Burton very properly styles 'illegal usurpation.' With gratitude to God we acknowledge that much of this pernicious and intolerant legislation has been done away; and there is no portion of religious liberty enjoyed by Wesleyans or Independents, which we do not wish to see equally enjoyed by the members of the Episcopal Church. Dr. Burton contends that the Church of England has lost its liberty, and that she can never recover it while in such close alliance with the state. 'I could never,' he frankly says, 'defend the union of Church and State, merely because it gives to my Church exclusive privileges, but because I believe it to be a means of upholding religion, and of extending Christ's kingdom upon earth.' If we believed this, we can assure

the learned Canon, that we should be found amongst its most zealous advocates. ' If,' he proceeds to say, ' the Church is crippled in its energies by being united to the State'; (and he has been admitting that it is so crippled;) ' if the Legislature, instead of advancing religion, should retard it; ' (e. g. by calling away bishops from their spiritual concerns;) ' if the Church is forced against her will to submit to regulations which she knows to be bad; not only has she a right, but it is her duty to assert her independence, and to act for herself.' . . . ' If I could feel certain, that the only consequence of a separation of Church and State would be, *our getting rid of the interference of the House of Commons*, I could hardly, as a friend to the Church and to Religion, continue to wish for their union.'

If we thought that Earl Grey read the Eclectic Review, we should respectfully appeal to his Lordship, whether, after such an avowal as that, from the Oxford Regius Professor of Divinity, Protestant Dissenters can be justly chargeable with fanaticism or radicalism, in desiring to see the alliance dissolved, which seems to be becoming almost as unpalatable to both parties as that between Holland and Belgium. For Dissenters to insist upon such a separation in the language of demand, were indeed absurd and insolent. It is a national, not a Dissenting question; a complicated, profound, and delicate question, not to be approached with flippant levity or coxcombical ignorance. We offer no apology for those individuals who have in this spirit obtruded their crude notions upon the Cabinet or the public. But the opinion itself, that the separation would be beneficial, is not confined to Dissenters. Dr. Burton says, that he has ' met with persons who are called " extremely high-church", who denounce the present connexion between Church and State as an unholy union, and who feel it a solemn duty to pray for their separation.' ' When extremes are thus seen to meet,' he remarks, ' we may suspect that the two parties, though using the same terms, do not really mean the same thing; or that, at least, they desire the same object from very different motives, and with very different expectations.' There is certainly room for such a suspicion; and as Dr. Burton, after favouring us with his own views of what is meant by a separation of the Church from the State, calls upon the Dissenters (at p. 16) to assist him in the discussion, we cheerfully comply with his courteous invitation, and will tell him, as distinctly as we can, what we mean by the phrase, and what are our motives and expectations in desiring what the too equivocal phrase is intended to express.

We must commence with defining our terms. What is the Church? What is the State? And what is the Church-and-State? Many persons, Dr. Burton justly remarks, speak of the union of Church and State without attaching any very definite

ideas to the words. ‘The term *Church* certainly does not mean ‘merely the clergy, though this is one of its senses,’ (and a Popish sense it is,) ‘and though,’ adds Dr. B., ‘Lord Henley and other writers upon Church Reform, have run into this fallacy. ‘The Church (as we apply the term in this country) means all those persons, lay and clerical, who call themselves members of ‘the Church of England, and who profess to receive her Articles ‘and Liturgy.’ It is singular enough that Dr. Burton should, in the very attempt to expose a fallacy, afford a specimen of it, employing the word *Church* in two different senses in the same sentence. The *Church* means, he says, the whole body of those who receive *her* Articles. Here, then, is a *Church* collective and a *Church* abstractive; and the question arises, Of whom is the latter composed? ‘The *Church* hath power to decree rites and ‘ceremonies and authority in matters of faith.’ Does this mean that such a power is vested in, or derived from, all those persons who call themselves members of the *Church*? Assuredly not. The *Church* political, with which alone we have to do in the present reference, must be understood to mean the Government of the *Church*, how improper soever such a use of the word may be; precisely as the term *State*, which properly implies the realm, including the whole population, more ordinarily denotes the Government of the *State*. In England, Dr. Burton says, ‘the *State* may ‘be said to mean the King and his Parliament.’ Then why has he tried to mystify the subject, by using the word *State* in the sense of kingdom, and then talking of the union between the *Church* and the *State* as consisting in this; that every member of the *State* (community) was also held to be a member of the *Church* (Christian body)? This did not constitute the union; it was the result of it. ‘The King and his Parliament, in legislating for ‘the *Church* of England, considered every person in the kingdom ‘to belong to that *Church*.’ And why did they so consider? Was it a mere opinion, an innocent theory that was thus assumed? No; they decreed that so it should be. Every individual member of the commonwealth was compelled by law to profess himself to be of the religion of the *State*, that is, to hold the same creed as his Sovereign, on pain of being treated as a heretic and traitor. His belief was made part of his allegiance, and nonconformity was rebellion. Dr. Burton calls upon the Dissenters to point out the Act or Acts which united the *Church* with the *State*, and to mark the time at which they became united. Why should he ask them to do what he has done so explicitly for them?

‘The earliest interferences of Parliament in matters of religion, without the consent of the clergy, were to check the encroachments of the see of Rome. . . At a somewhat later period, the *Church* of Rome was itself the cause of the civil power interfering in matters of religion. When heretical opinions, as they were called, began to increase, the

spiritual arm was not strong enough to suppress them without calling in the secular. Hence statutes were passed for the burning of heretics ; and from this time we may certainly say, that one form of religion was supported by the State to the exclusion of every other.'—p. 16.

The origin of the Church and State system, and the true principle of the alliance, could not be more succinctly and correctly described : and thus we see that (Dr. Burton himself being witness) it had its cause and origin in Popery, and its object was religious persecution. In fact, it sprang up in the same way as the other horns of the seven-headed beast. The ' spiritual arm,' or rather the arm of spiritual usurpation, called in the sword of the secular arm ; just as the Jewish Church called in the arm of the Roman power to put to death Our Saviour. But the Church, having once conjured up the demon, named 'the secular arm,' found herself unable to dismiss him at pleasure ; and the servant soon became too strong for its master. Thus it came to pass that Henry VIII. ' exercised powers, as head of the Church, which,' Dr. Burton thinks, ' he had no right to assume.' But his daughters exercised the same powers ; and the 1 Eliz. c. 2 , the 35th Eliz. c. 1., and similar statutes, upon which the Church Establishment of this country is founded, are as atrocious in principle as the Six Article Act itself.

The struggle at first, however, Dr. Burton remarks, ' was ' maintained between rival doctrines, not between rival churches.' A sentence not very intelligible, since doctrines can neither persecute nor be burned ; but we gather the learned Writer's meaning from the sentence which follows. ' The leaders of the Reformation in this country never thought of separating from the ' Church of England.' How should they, unless they resolved to leave the country, since the Church and the whole community of the nation were, we have seen, identical, and the government of Church and of State were also identified ? But they separated from the Church of Rome ; and from that time, the Church of Rome in England existed as a separate Church. ' The Roman ' Catholics were from that time dissenters,' says Dr. Burton, ' but they were not acknowledged as such.' No ; another *name* was given to them. But, recognised or not, they retained the essential characteristics of a church ; nor can we understand what the learned Professor means by denying that the struggle was between rival churches. Whether Popish or Protestant, the Church of England, he contends, was still the Church of England : although the doctrines were changed, the sees and temporalities remained ; and so did the penal statutes. It would be more correct, however, to say, that the Church establishment remained the same ; not the Church established ; else we must discard the notion that Symbols, Articles, and a Ritual, form an essential part of the constitu-

tion of a Church, and so resolve the idea into a simple affair of political government.

This is, certainly, the idea attached to the word, when we speak of Church and State. What we thereby understand is a complex system of government resulting from an interference on the part of the secular power in matters of religion, with a view to crush and extirpate, or at least to discountenance, every form of religion but that of the sect in alliance with the State. The primary object of such alliance is, to suppress erroneous opinions, and to punish their abettors. Every ecclesiastical establishment has been based upon the Divine right of intolerance. The support of the State to 'the church by law established,' has always been given in the shape of penal statutes, designed to force the creeds and rites of the Church upon the community as a matter of political duty. Dissenters 'sometimes speak,' Dr. Burton complains, 'as if the Church had been united to the State by an 'Act or Acts of Parliament: and if this were so, the Acts might 'be repealed, and the separation would ensue. But unfortunately, we may search all the volumes of the Statutes at large, 'and no such acts will be found.' And yet, this same Dr. Burton tells us, that, from the time that statutes were passed for the burning of heretics, we may certainly say, that 'one form of religion was supported by the State to the exclusion of every 'other.' What is this but the very union of which we are speaking?—a union, the history of which is contained in the penal legislation of the Tudors and the Stuarts in matters of religion. When the burning of heretics went out of fashion, the hanging of covenanters, and the incarceration of puritans, and the fining of nonconformists, were the means by which the Church and State sought to support one form of religion to the exclusion of every other. The Toleration Act introduced a further mitigation of the penal statutes against nonconformity, leaving the spirit of persecution to work only by the milder instrumentality of civil disabilities. So essentially does the existing union between Church and State consist in the perpetuation of these milder penalties, that the repeal of the Test-act was deprecated by Churchmen themselves as tantamount to the dissolution of the cherished alliance,—as cutting asunder almost the last tie that held Church and State together. Dr. Burton seems inclined to take this view of the matter; and he asks, whether the union of Church and State can be said to exist, when every member of the State is no longer of necessity a member of the Church, and 'when the clergy and parliament together have not the power of 'binding the whole community in spiritual matters.'

'The Dissenters,' he proceeds to say, 'seem to think that the union does still continue, for they are louder than ever in their demands that Church and State should be separated: and it is this which leads me

to call upon them to state explicitly, what they mean by the union of Church and State, and to point out the process by which the separation can be effected. I am aware, that the Dissenters are not the only persons who consider the Church and the State to be still united, and who contemplate their separation. Mr. Wilks, the member for Boston, has published a letter to the Bristol Dissenters, in which he assures them, that “the opinion of *the Government*” is, that “any immediate and urgent attempt at the severance of Church and State would utterly fail.” My question is therefore likely to be answered, if not by the Government, at least by the Member for Boston in the present session.’ pp. 69, 70.

What answer the Member for Boston would give, we have not the means of divining; but the Government have spoken for themselves. We transcribe from the public journals the following extract from the speech of Earl Grey, in the debate on the Address to the Throne, on the 5th ult.

‘The last and the most important topic to which it would be his duty to refer, was the situation of the established church. The noble duke (Wellington) had spoken much on the subject of caution in any measures which ministers might think it their duty to advise his Majesty to adopt respecting the church. He agreed with the noble duke—he approved his advice—he had already acted upon it. With the noble duke he (Earl Grey) deprecated any attempt at rash innovation; nor did he wish anything like a general change in the establishment of the church . . . . If the noble duke was really anxious that he should make a confession of faith, he would not decline doing it; for he had not an opinion that he would not boldly avow, or that he was ashamed to acknowledge. And he would therefore tell the noble duke, that he was a sincere adherent, a devoted friend to the Church of England, that he had ever been a zealous supporter of it, and that he had never lent himself, and never would lend himself to those theories—under whatever specious name of separating Church and State they might be designated, which, wild and extravagant in themselves, could not be otherwise than dangerous in their results. He had never concealed these opinions—in that house, in every situation of life he had ever maintained and defended them; and in his various interviews at different times with members of the dissenting body, he had stated them distinctly. He was anxious that real grievances should be redressed, that unmerited disabilities should be removed; (and he believed that many enlightened heads of the church shared this wish in common with him;)—that relief should be given from all those restrictions which reason denounced and necessity did not justify. But, if there was any attempt to be made to go further—any effort to separate the Church from the State, because, as some persons idly said, the connexion was unchristian—if this was the end to be aimed at, then he (Earl Grey) knew his course; his duty was plain and clear—he knew where and how to take his stand, and he would take it—to all such attempts he would offer the most determined, the most unflinching resistance; and those who led the assault should not merely find he was

no supporter of such doctrines—that in his breast they found no sympathy; but that at all risks, and under all circumstances, he would be their most uncompromising opponent. But he did think, for the sake of the church itself—and this opinion he knew he held in common with many other warm friends of the establishment—that its state should be carefully looked into, and that there were many things that might be beneficially altered, so that complaints might be removed. He thought they ought to look most thoroughly into the subject, in the conviction that measures truly conservative might be adopted—not employing the word conservative in its much abused sense, but according to its right and proper meaning—conservative of the really useful and good, and so as greatly to strengthen and support the foundations of the church.'

To what wild and extravagant theories veiled under the specious name of separating Church and State, Earl Grey might allude, it is of course impossible for us to say. His Lordship might possibly refer to reformers *within* the Church, who, like Lord Henley, wish to alienate all church patronage from the Crown, and to discharge the bishops from their baronial duties, with a view to 'sever the unnatural alliance between the Church and the world.' Or, he might allude to certain political Dissenters without, whose theories and declamations would seem to go to the extent of destroying the Church, instead of merely separating it from the State, extinguishing it even as a corporate body, and not leaving to the State any specifically Protestant character. Against the latter class of theorists, we beg permission to join in his Lordship's emphatic protest. But, in expressing his anxiety that the real grievances of Dissenters should be redressed, and all unmerited disabilities and unreasonable restrictions removed, the Premier not only conceded all that Dissenters make the subject-matter of their claims: whether consciously or not, he has pledged his assent to the virtual, though not the formal dissolution of the alliance between the secular and the spiritual arm, upon which the whole structure of the Establishment rests. When the last penal disqualification and unjust restriction shall be abolished, the Church will remain in all her spiritual integrity, but the Establishment will be abrogated.

We agree with Dr. Burton, that the union between Church and State is already more than three fourths dissolved; and as no evil has resulted from this, but much good, we cannot deem the apprehensions very reasonable, of any injury that might arise to the constitution from doing away with the other fourth. If he wishes to know in what consists that union which still continues, and which Dissenters wish to see terminated, we beg leave to refer him to an article which recently appeared in a weekly journal that is understood to possess the confidence and to speak the sentiments of the Evangelical Dissenters. 'The Times' news-

paper had expressed a wish that the opposers of the Church would define their terms more accurately, and had put the same question to the Dissenters, that Dr. Burton has done—‘ What is the ‘ Union between Church and State ? ’ The “ Patriot ” meets this question, by first pointing out what the union, in its original perfection, included ; reciting the various penal statutes enacted against Nonconformists down to the 12 Anne, c. 7., which prohibited Dissenters from educating their own children, requiring them to be put into the hands of Conformists ; and the article then proceeds as follows.

‘ This is Church and State, or what an able French writer styles, *le système féodale et hiératique*. This is what some people call National Religion ; others, the Alliance between Religion and good Government ; but which Dissenters are so unreasonable as to deem bad legislation and anti-Christian policy. Against this system they have had to struggle ; and, by slow and painful degrees, these Pariars of the State have won concessions from the Legislature, in spite of *Brachminical* intolerance. They obtained, first, toleration, i. e. permission to worship God, to keep schools, to educate their own children, &c. ; then, protection and legal recognition ; then, a few much grudged marks of royal favour ; at length, the formal repeal of the annually suspended Test Act, excluding them from Parliament. And now what would they have more ? They complain of being still viewed as a caste, not, as formerly, proscribed, but lying under humiliating disqualifications of the most unjust description, and exposed to both insult and serious inconvenience from the extant remains of the Church and State despotism. What these are, shall now be stated.

‘ 1. The system of Parochial Registration, the absurdity and vexatious injustice of which are so ably exposed in the article cited from *The Times* in our last paper. This is an integral part of the Church and State system ; so that one of the clerical witnesses examined by the Committee objected, that to admit Dissenters to the benefit of a civil registration would *further legalize the existence of Dissent* ! “ It is rather late in the day,” remarks *The Globe*, “ for such an objection.” But some people wake very late, and do not trouble themselves about the time of day. “ Dissent is already legal,” remarks our contemporary. It is so, hence the absurdity of treating it as illegal.

‘ 2. What the *Times* styles, “ the barbarous restraint imposed upon Dissenters in the non-celebration of their marriages according to their own religious rites.” This is intimately connected both with the sacerdotal theory adopted from Rome, and with the Church and State polity. It is a relic of compulsive conformity. And with this we may connect, as part and parcel of the same system, the exclusion of the bodies of Dissenters from the consecrated burial-ground. Upon this point, there has not been a little quibbling. All persons buried in the parochial cemetery must be buried according to the rites of the Church, except suicides and persons unbaptized. But numbers of Dissenters die unbaptized, and the validity of their baptism has been in numerous cases questioned. The clergyman may then refuse to

bury, and, by so doing, exclude from interment. Can anything be more insulting or oppressive? But this is the *système féodale et hiératique*.

‘3. The tithe system, civil and ecclesiastical. We speak not now of the fiscal exaction, so much as the *principle* of the system. The tithe is not like any other civil claim, which may be enforced in the common-law courts; but tithe causes fall under the cognizance of ecclesiastical courts and courts of equity. The former are the remains of the barbarous legislation of feudal ages, and loudly call for searching reform. The tithe itself, as now shared between the feudal nobility and the sacerdotal order, affords a beautiful specimen of the Church and State union. There was a time when the clergy possessed above half the military fees, that is, of the landed property of the kingdom. The hierarchy has, in later days, been spoiled and reduced to subserviency by the aristocracy; and hence the present anomalous state of the complex tithe system.

‘4. The baronial privileges and duties of the prelates.

‘5. The exercise of temporal jurisdiction by persons in holy orders, as magistrates, perpetual chairmen of vestries, &c., by which the Church and State system is brought to bear upon the labouring classes; parish benefactions and adequate parochial relief being in numberless cases withheld from the chapel-going poor. As a minister of religion, the Dissenting pastor may possibly be far superior in character to the episcopal clergyman; why is he to be degraded to a civil inferiority? Because such is the alliance system.

‘6. Compulsory payments levied on the members of all unendowed churches in support of the endowed Church.

‘7. Exclusion from the national seminaries of education, from the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge down to the charity schools and so called national schools. The system of exclusion, be it remembered, is connected with laws rendering a University education a pre-requisite for civil advancement, and with the systematic denial of literary honours to Dissenters, however eminent in science or learning. “Every department of tuition being prohibited to Protestant Dissenters by various statutes and canons, it is only on condition of qualifying specially, that they are now permitted, under a remedial statute, (19 Geo. III. c. 44, s. 2,) to exercise these professions with impunity.” This is of course no grievance! A mere stigma left after the yoke has been removed! Dissenters, however, will not and ought not to be satisfied, till the whole system of national instruction shall be placed on a sounder foundation than the Church and State system of priestly domination, and till the last remains of that yoke be removed from their necks, which “neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear.” This is what they mean by a dissolution of the alliance or union between Church and State.’ *Patriot*, Jan. 15, 1834.

The only constituent part of the union, mentioned in the above analysis, that does not partake of a penal character, is that which relates to the parliamentary power exercised by the bishops as ‘lords spiritual.’ Dissenters have suffered so much in former

times from the political power of the prelates, that they ought to be pardoned, if they think that they are not safe, so long as this sign and relic of the alliance between the spiritual and the secular arms remains. But we agree with the able Editor of the *Times*, that this is 'an *adjunct* to our Church establishment,' rather than an essential part of it. 'We ourselves,' he says, 'see no necessity at least for such an adjunct; and on its expediency, we do not very much differ from those who feel that the proper sphere for a bishop is his diocese.' The Church of Scotland is united to the State, to a certain extent; and yet, it has no mitred representatives in Parliament. Dr. Burton seems to dispute that the ejection of the bishops from the House of Lords would be an immediate or necessary consequence of the separation of Church and State, or that they sit there in consequence of the union of Church and State. Coleridge, in his 'Idea of the Constitution,' tells us, that the Bishops sit in the House of Peers 'by virtue of the baronies which, much against the will of those haughty prelates, our kings forced upon them.' However this may be, we concede that the right of the king to summon spiritual as well as temporal peers to Parliament, is a distinct constitutional question; and that what we understand by the union of Church and State, namely, the establishment of a particular sect or form of religion by penal laws intended to suppress or discountenance all other sects,—does not consist in bishops sitting in Parliament, but in the union of spiritual and secular power; of which an extremely small portion is now left in the hands of the prelates. With the political objections that have been urged against their retaining their seats in parliament, we do not concern ourselves. For the honour of religion, we may wish that their title of spiritual peers had been better supported by a distinguishing patriotic resistance against every form of corruption, by a uniform and consistent advocacy of the claims of freedom, humanity, and religion, by an independency worthy of the episcopal office, and by a superiority to the spirit of intrigue and faction. But these considerations must be excluded from the present discussion. The Bishops sat in Parliament, as did the abbots, before the House of Commons had an existence; and they are recognized by the Constitution as forming, with the great body of the clergy, a distinct estate of the realm. But the baronial privilege does not necessarily attach to the Episcopal office, since, of the Irish Bishops, four only sit as peers; and the royal summons is still deemed a necessary formality in order to entitle any peer, temporal or spiritual, to take his seat. We are disposed to think that the separation of Church and State might be effected without touching the parliamentary privileges of the Bishops; and although we agree with many pious members of the Established Church in the opinion, that their Lordships ought to be relieved

from the burden of duties incompatible with their proper functions, we regard the matter as more a national than a Dissenting grievance.

Dr. Burton has adverted to two or three other consequences which, he thinks, would result from the separation proposed. We should be sorry to blink one of the real difficulties that may be connected with this delicate subject; but we cannot regard any of his 'questions' as presenting a very formidable problem. Some of them are as irrelevant as they are insidious, and a very brief answer will dispose of them. For instance: What is to be done, he asks, with the patronage in the gift of the Crown? We refer him to Lord Henley. Who is to issue the *congé d'érire*? Let the clergy have leave to elect their own bishops. What is to become of those Acts of Parliament which give to the King the adjudication of all causes, spiritual as well as temporal, within his dominions? These will not be in the slightest degree affected by the separation. What is to be done with the Coronation Oath? It may stand as it does, although Dr. Burton seems to think that it is of little use, since the Church cannot make use of it as a bugbear. But the most serious difficulty of all remains to be noticed. Hitherto, in all acts of parliament, 'the terms, spiritual person, or person in holy orders, or person, or priest, or clergy,' Dr. B. remarks, 'have had a fixed and definite meaning, being restricted to persons episcopally ordained according to the forms of the Church of England.' 'When that Church becomes merely the Episcopal denomination, and on a level with other denominations, it must be settled by Act of Parliament, that every preacher of the 'Gospel is a spiritual person.' What a blessed Act of Parliament would that be, that should so settle matters, as that this should indeed be the fact! Every preacher of the Gospel *ought* to be 'a spiritual person'; but, even after the separation of Church and State, we should fear that there would be too many persons in holy orders, or pretended holy orders, that would ill deserve to be so designated. But surely Dr. Burton would not grudge to Dissenting Ministers *benefit of clergy*! The term *priest*, they have no wish to appropriate: *that* might remain, therefore, as a term of distinction, Dissenting pastors being styled ministers of religion, and Episcopal clergymen, priests. The difficulty would not be, as Dr. B. imagines, in hitting upon a definition sufficiently comprehensive to include all preachers, but in selecting one sufficiently specific to designate the parties whom the purposes of the law might require to be distinguished. This difficulty, however, he will be happy to learn, has already been got over, in various recent Acts of Parliament, without giving umbrage to any of the parties concerned.

We trust that we have now explained to Dr. Burton's satisfac-

tion, what we mean by a union of Church and State, and what is the process by which we wish to see the separation consummated. When he comes to understand our sentiments, we are not without sanguine hopes that he will own that Dissenters are in the right. The liberality which he has shewn in some parts of his present pamphlet, warrants this expectation ; and still more the enlightened discrimination displayed in the following passage, which we transcribe with much pleasure.

‘ The union of Church and State is not the same thing with the union of Religion and the State, though the two expressions are often confounded. Religion and the State may be said to be united, when the State encourages Religion, and enforces it by laws : and where the Christian Religion is the one thus supported, the Church and the State may in one sense be said to be united ; for the term *Church*, in its widest sense, means the universal Church, or whole body of believers in Christ. But this would be an equivocal meaning, and is not what is generally implied by the union of Church and State, which means that the State supports by its laws one particular Church, or one form of Christianity to the exclusion of others.’—p. 68.

These admirable remarks place in a striking light the *anti-Catholic* spirit and tendency of that union of Church and State which disunites the Church, by severing the particular Church or favoured sect from every other communion. Thus, not only does the union of Church and State in this country prevent the Episcopal Church from holding religious communion with the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, or with any of the Dissenting sections of the Church of Christ in England, but it equally forbids all connexion with the Protestant Churches of France, Switzerland, Prussia, and Germany. This has resulted, it is true, partly from the unbending character and pretensions of the Episcopal polity itself ; but the Episcopacy of the Church of England would long since have become much nearer what Usher, and Leighton, and Burnet desired to see it—a much more moderate, and reasonable, and catholic, and apostolic system,—had it not been for the fatal alliance that has deprived the Church of her own liberty, and rendered her the oppressor of all who dissent from her. The penal laws intended for her support, have fortified her in unsocial bigotry.

The union of Religion and the State, too often confounded, as Dr. Burton remarks, with the union of Church and State, we ardently desire to see better understood and more effectively realised. Religion and the State may be said to be united, we are told by the learned Professor, ‘ when the State *encourages Religion*, and so *enforces* it by laws’, and thus ‘ *supports* it.’ But to encourage, to enforce, and to support, are phrases conveying very distinct and different ideas. Understanding by the term *State*, the Government or Legislature, we should prefer to say, that Re-

ligion and the State are most happily united, where the State *protects* Religion, and *recognises* Religion, and *enforces* it by public homage and example. This includes nearly all, we apprehend, that Christianity requires of the State, or can be advantaged by receiving from it. Such appears to be the Church and State system of the United States of America. In that country, according to the highest judicial authorities, Christianity is established and supported to this extent; and the Church and State may therefore, as Dr. Burton admits, in one sense, be said to be united. 'The people of the United States have retained the Christian religion as the foundation of their civil, legal, and political institutions, while they have refused to continue a legal preference of any one of its forms over another.' Such is the correct statement of a writer in the Christian Observer, who is anxious, however, to make it appear that the only difference between *this* system and the English Church and State system, is one of *degree*; and that the proper degree to which things ought to be carried, is 'far more wisely and Scripturally determined in Great Britain than in the United States.' Upon this complacent conclusion, Mr. Colton remarks as follows:

'And is there, then, no difference, except of *degree*, between a Catholic recognition of Christianity by the State, as is done in America, and the enforcement of one particular form of it upon the community, as is done by an Establishment? The Americans will suffer *any* degree but the last; and that they think involves a *principle* which they do not tolerate; viz. the right of one man, or any body of men, to choose a religion for others, or to impose it upon them.

'If the Christian Observer has been surprised to find the Americans so orthodox in *kind*, and defective only in *degree*; and if any others in England are to be surprised by his disclosure; it only proves the truth of his own assertion: that "it is not generally understood in England, what are the real *facts* of the case" in America.

'Whatever, therefore, the Christian Observer may have proved, he has certainly failed to find an American advocate of a State Religious Establishment, in the sense of giving one sect a pre-eminence by law. Whatever else, and whatever less than this, he has proved, of the kind which he has seemed to be in pursuit of, we like it all the better, because he has also proved, that a nation may be a Christian nation without an Establishment; and because he has proved what may go to convince our English friends, that Americans are not such radicals as they have been represented; that they are not bigots; and that a man may freely express his opinions there, and yet retain his influence. We shall expect to rise in the esteem of such persons as the Christian Observer, as they come to know us better.

'Certainly, the Christian Observer did not mean, that the American authorities, on which he relied to prove the orthodoxy or semi-orthodoxy of American opinions, were either open or secret advocates of an Establishment; nor will it be pretended, that they did not understand themselves—that they were teaching a doctrine which they never in-

tended. That would be singular, indeed ; and would prove sufficiently, that neither the Christian Observer, nor any body else, would have a right to it, as coming from them. I cannot, therefore, easily see what the Christian Observer has been aiming at in these articles, nor what he has gained, as an advocate of Establishments. We, certainly, are much obliged to him for having done a work which would not perhaps have had the same influence, if undertaken by us ; but of which, having been brought to our hands from such a quarter, we may fairly avail ourselves : That the American community is not slightly leavened with Christianity.' p. 35.

In a trial for blasphemy, before the Supreme Court of New York in 1811, the Chief Justice, Chancellor Kent, in delivering his opinion, used the following language, which will indicate the sense and extent in which Christianity is recognised in America, as ' part and parcel of the law of the land.'

“ The authorities shew that blasphemy against God, and contumelious reproaches and profane ridicule of Christ, or the Holy Scriptures, (which are equally treated as blasphemy,) are offences punishable at common law, whether uttered by words or writings. The consequences may be less extensively pernicious in the one case than in the other ; but in both instances the reviling is still an offence, because it tends to corrupt the morals of the people, and to destroy good order. Such offences have always been considered independent of any Religious Establishment or the Rights of the Church. There is nothing in our manners and institutions which has prevented the application or the necessity of this point of the common law. We stand equally in need now as formerly, of all that moral discipline, and of those principles of virtue, which help to bind society together. The people of this State, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity, as the rule of their faith and practice ; and to scandalize the Author of these doctrines is not only, in a religious point of view, extremely impious, but, even in respect to the obligations due to society, is a gross violation of decency and good order. Nothing could be more offensive to the virtuous part of the community, or more injurious to the tender morals of the young, than to declare such profanity lawful. It would go to confound all distinction between things sacred and profane ; for, to use the words of one of the greatest oracles of human wisdom, (Lord Bacon,) ‘ Profane scoffing doth by little and little deface the reverence for religion : ’ and who adds, in another place, ‘ Two principal causes have I ever known of Atheism,—curious controversies and profane scoffing.’ The very idea of jurisprudence, with the ancient lawgivers and philosophers, embraced the religion of the country : *Jurisprudentia est divinarum atque humanarum rerum notitia.* And though the Constitution has discarded Religious Establishments, it does not forbid judicial cognizance of those offences against religion and morality which have no reference to any such Establishment, or to any particular form of government, but are punishable, because they strike at the root of moral obligation, and weaken the security of the social ties. The legislative exposition of the Constitution is con-

formable to this view of it. Christianity, in its enlarged sense, as a religion revealed and taught in the Bible, is not unknown to our law. The Statute for preventing immorality consecrates the first day of the week as holy time, and considers the violation of it immoral. The act concerning oaths, re-organizes the common-law mode of administering an oath, by laying the hand on and kissing the Gospels. Surely, then, we are bound to conclude, that wicked and malicious words, writings, and actions, which go to vilify those Gospels, continue, as at common law, to be an offence against public peace and safety. They are inconsistent with the reverence due to the administration of an oath ; and, among other evil consequences, they tend to lessen in the public mind its religious sanction." pp. 45, 6.

So much for the nature of that union of Religion and the State which subsists in America without an Establishment. Now as to the results. Very industrious, but not very fair and candid attempts have lately been made to prove, that the past and present condition of religion and morality in the United States, is such as to afford an unanswerable argument for the necessity of Establishments. These representations, Mr. Colton has shewn to be alike disingenuous and unfounded. It would lead us too far, to go minutely into his statements : the following extracts will be sufficient for our present purpose, and we strongly recommend our readers to obtain a copy of the pamphlet from which they are taken.

‘ By the last census of 1830, the population of the United States was 12,866,020. Allowing 300 Roman Catholic priests, we shall have, of all denominations, as may be seen, full *one* minister for every *thousand souls* by the last estimate of the last census. Deducting the Roman Catholics and those not esteemed Orthodox, all of which, in their own connexions, doubtless have their own influence in promoting morality and securing the good order of society, we shall still have 11,138 ministers, whose Christianity is generally sound, whose qualifications are for the most part fitted for the several classes of society among which their labours are distributed, and a very great proportion of whom would not suffer by comparison in piety and professional learning with any set of men of the same class in the Christian world, when viewed *en masse*, and in their ordinary relations to society.

‘ Thus much, to show, that, rapidly as the population of the United States has increased, the virtue of the Christian public there, having been roused by information and suitable appeals, has not only kept pace with this march in supplying a proportionate number of the ministers of religion, but has actually gained upon it, and bids fair, in these provisions for the spiritual wants of the people, soon to attain the limits of its aspirations.’ p. 9.

Speaking of the average qualifications of these ministers, Mr. Colton says :

‘ The Presbyterians and Congregationalists in America, (about 3000), have unquestionably more solid learning, than all of the other deno-

minations put together. A minister cannot move in their ranks and be respected, without having had a liberal education, unless the redeeming powers of superior talents shall raise him above contempt. The Episcopalian, the Dutch and German Reformed, the German Lutherans and Calvinists, ramifications of Scotch churches, and some others, perhaps, all being of the smaller denominations, are upon the same level with Presbyterians and Congregationalists. They are "workmen that need not to be ashamed." As men of learning, the Unitarians of Massachusetts will not suffer in comparison with any other; but alas! they have let go the Head.

"The clergy of America, my Lord, with a few exceptions, are all *working men*; and they are becoming more and more so. It is the fashion—it is the spirit of the times. They generally appreciate the spiritual wants of the nation, and feel their responsibility. This is a part of their education. And a great and effectual door is open to them in the hearts of the people. The people are not jealous of them—how can they be? And they are not jealous of each other, as being of different sects; as all sects, in all parts of the land, have at last been reduced to a common level, as to relative rights between themselves, and between the State and them. Their only chance of superior influence is by superior virtue."\* pp. 10, 11.

"It is not enough, in the consideration of this subject, to look merely at the comparative number of ministers actually at work, and to estimate the amount of their labours, and the degrees of their influence; but the peculiar difficulties under which America has laboured, as a new country, and with a population doubling every twenty-five years, are also to be taken into the account. And yet, with all these disadvantages to struggle with, it would appear, not only that she is far better supplied than England, in proportion to the population; but her supply of ministers has gained and still gains upon the increase of population, while that of England is going backwards, the Establishment alone being taken into the account. Your Lordship's own evidence

---

\* A curious instance of blundering misrepresentation is exposed by Mr. Colton, which occurs in a shallow, flippant publication, entitled, "Essays on the Church." To prove the inefficiency of the voluntary system, it is remarked, that, in Massachusetts and Connecticut, where Christianity was established by law, the Presbyterian ministers supported and settled were in the proportion of 1 to every 1364 inhabitants, while, in the states where there was no establishment, the proportion of the same class was 1 to every 19,300. This comparative statement overlooks entirely the existence of other denominations, two of them (the Baptists and Methodists) by far the most numerous in the United States; and does not even recognize the Episcopalian, who have always been in Virginia the dominant sect, and are numerous in the more southern States. Dr. Dwight, the authority for the comparative statement, was giving an account of the number only of *Presbyterian* ministers; and this Writer makes it serve as that of the ministers of all denominations! Otherwise, his argument falls to the ground. Yet this grossly fallacious statement has been swallowed with eager avidity.

decides this question:—"I conceive, that *little or no provision* has been made for the wants of the population which has arisen since the last two censuses."

"London and its adjacent boroughs contain 194 places of worship belonging to the Establishment, with a population of 1,500,000. Your Lordship has given in evidence, that "*not one-tenth*" of the people are provided for. And how *much* less than one-tenth? New York has a population of 220,000, and 101 churches—one church to 1,200 souls. Boston has 50 churches to 60,000; and other large cities in America are equally well supplied; many of them better.

"There are in the United States, excluding the Roman Catholics and all other sects not commonly esteemed orthodox, 1,601,088 communicants at the Lord's table, by the latest authentic reports I have been able to obtain, some of which are two and three years old, and none less than one year. There are also some orthodox denominations not reported. I have observed, that the annual increase of communicants in American churches of late, taking into view the different sects, ranges from one-fourth to one-tenth of the gross amount; and that the greatest proportionate increase is in the most numerous denominations. Taking these facts into consideration, I have supposed the present number of communicants in the American orthodox churches cannot be less than 1,800,000. In those denominations, comprehending the great bulk of these communicants, the terms of admission to the Lord's supper are, a strict examination, as to personal piety, and a public profession of religion. Generally, so far as I have been able to observe, the terms of admittance to this ordinance in America, are much more strict, than in the corresponding denominations in Great Britain. In the Church of England, if I do not mistake, all are admitted to this sacrament, who are of respectable character. And yet it appears by a sufficient amount of evidence from a high quarter of the Church of England, that the number of communicants throughout the English Establishment, does not exceed 350,000. Taking the population of England at 12,000,000, there is about *one* communicant in the Church to every 34 of the gross population. Deducting 800,000 for the Roman Catholics in America, and taking the remainder of the population at 12,000,000, the same as in England, the number of communicants at the Lord's table will be nearer *one* of every 5, than of every 6 individuals. I confess, that I am altogether surprised at this result; and yet I do not know how to make it different. . . . .

"Your Lordship, and, as it would seem, many others connected with the Church of England, have appeared inclined to recommend an Establishment for America; at least to say, the Americans have made a great mistake in dispensing with it. Now, my Lord, we are of course to understand, doubtless, that the English Establishment is the most perfect model; and its history and working are to be looked to for our encouragement? But the voice of the nation in Parliament has pronounced, that the Irish branch has worked badly, and the reforming hand has already been applied to it. Where will it stop? Shall we not wait and see? The voice of the nation is clamorous against what are declared to be the enormities of the English

Establishment; and a majority of the Church itself will probably unite with the Government in the application of a reforming influence there. Shall we not wait and see the end of that? And if it seems so intolerable to the British nation, how, my Lord, think you, must it appear unto us?' pp. 57—59.

And now to return to Dr. Burton. It is singular enough, that a pamphlet written with a view to expose the unreasonableness of the claims of the Dissenters, should commence with attributing to them, as their 'first and most comprehensive demand,' what has not even been put forward at all as a demand, in any of their memorials, petitions, or other documents, with one or two regretted exceptions. Dissenters have never ceased to protest against the union of Church and State; but that, we submit, is quite a different thing from *demanding* that it shall be put an end to. We are very glad, however, that Dr. Burton has been induced to disclose his "Thoughts upon the Separation;" and we have not shrunk from giving ours. But we must now advert as briefly as possible to the notice which he has bestowed upon the practical grievances, the removal of which is expressly sought for in the language, not of demand, but of remonstrance and petition. Why Dr. Burton has chosen to take his statement of those grievances from what he calls 'two documents,' but which are, in fact, merely two ill-written paragraphs, one from a country paper, the other from a London weekly journal of no consideration and small respectability,—in preference to the authentic documents to which he might easily have had access,—we are at a loss to conjecture. It is curious enough, however, that these two identical newspapers are also the selected authority of the Late Fellow of All Souls' College. There must be a great dearth of newspapers at Oxford. We beg to inform these reverend and learned persons, that, in almost all the memorials and petitions which have been presented to Government or the Legislature, the grievances complained of have been enumerated in the following terms and order:

1. The want of a legal Registration of Births, Marriages, and Deaths.
2. Compulsory Conformity to the Rites and Ceremonies of the Established Church in the celebration of Marriage.
3. The denial to Dissenters of the right of Burial by their own Ministers in the Parochial Cemeteries.
4. The exclusion of Dissenters from the privileges of the Universities.
5. The liability of Dissenters to the payment of Church Rates and other Ecclesiastical demands.

With regard to the first of these, we had flattered ourselves that there existed but one opinion among well-informed persons, as to the want of a better system of registration for the nation

generally, and the undeniable claim of the Dissenters to some redress of the peculiar hardship and inconvenience to which they are liable. But we were mistaken. The Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford is so utterly ignorant of the notorious state of the fact, as to assert, that ‘the *parochial registers* give perfect ‘*satisfaction to the country*’!! He seems quite astonished at discovering that ‘Dissenters are not satisfied with having their ‘children baptized by the parochial clergy,’ who would regenerate them into the bargain; forgetting (for he cannot be ignorant of *this* fact) that there is a denomination of Protestants, known under the name of Baptists, who practice only adult baptism. ‘If Dissenters complain of any grievance in the article of registration,’ we are told, ‘they have brought it upon themselves, ‘and themselves must find the remedy.’ The extreme illiberality of this arrogant conclusion is quite unworthy of Dr. Burton.

The *ex-Fellow of All Souls* ‘does not feel ashamed to express himself incompetent to give an opinion’ upon the practical bearing of this question.

As to the second grievance, Dr. Burton says: ‘Let Dissenters obtain an Act of Parliament to regulate their own ‘marriages.’ They intend to do so; they have not waited for either advice or permission from the Canon of Christ Church. The remarks of the other learned Oxonian deserve transcription.

‘The next point to be insisted upon in the petitions is, the right of marriage without the Church service or the payment of fees to a clergyman. I speak as an individual when I express my hope, that, as far as the clergy of the Church are concerned, the petitioners will meet with no hinderance from us in this matter; nay more, that they will have our best wishes for the attainment of what they require. If they have conscientious scruples against the use of our marriage service, or our ministry, however mistaken we may think them to be, we cannot but in charity wish that their scruples should be respected, and that some other mode should be devised, by which the right descent of property, and the sacredness of the marriage tie, might be secured, without violating their consciences. Such an alteration would be a relief, not to them only, or to them chiefly, but at least as much to the ministers of the Church, who, as the law now stands, are sometimes placed in very difficult circumstances. For persons occasionally present themselves to claim the ministration of the clergyman in the marriage service, openly avowing their disbelief in the doctrine of the Trinity. No one can deny, that to perform offices of religion for such, especially to bless them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which is part of the marriage service, is at least a questionable exercise of the ministerial office; yet, if the clergyman refuses, he is liable to an action; so that timid men, through fear of being brought before public notice, and poor men, through fear of the inconveniences which their families would experience from the costs of an action, are

tempted to gulp the profanation. Surely, my Lords and Gentlemen, if, by an alteration in this matter, you can satisfy the reasonable desires of the respectable Dissenters, and afford relief to the ministers of your own Church, that alteration should be made.'

*Letter to the Members, &c., pp. 25—27.*

With regard to the third point, there prevails a most extraordinary degree of misapprehension. 'If the Dissenter argues 'that he has no interest in the parish church,' says Dr. Burton, 'it seems to follow necessarily that he has no interest in the 'churchyard.' This, whether meant for wit or for logic, is sorry trifling. Has a man no interest in what he has purchased? and is not a vault, or grave, which a man has purchased, his own freehold? If a Dissenter has bought a vault or a portion of the churchyard, we apprehend that his title to hold it is just as good as that of a churchman. A legal question has been raised, and learned opinions taken upon it, to whom the churchyard belongs, whether to the parish or to the parson. So far as respects the right of common, the grass on the surface, the right of the parson is, we suppose, generally admitted; and his claim to a fee for disturbing the surface may be maintained upon this ground. But, in whomsoever the original proprietary right may vest, the ground, so far as appropriated, unquestionably belongs to those who have purchased it. Dissenters have never contended, we believe, for the equal right of using the national burying grounds without purchase or payment; but they complain of not being allowed the free use of what they have acquired a right to consider as their own.

But we are met with another objection. 'If, in the conscientious opinion of the Dissenters,' says the Ex-Fellow of All Souls, 'we are so sunk in error and superstition, that they will 'not worship with us in our Father's house, nor feed with us at 'our Lord's table, why should they seek to defile their immaculate dead by the contagion of such ill company?' For the same reason that the members of the reformed and apostolic Church Episcopal did not refuse to bury their dead in churchyards defiled by the bodies of rank Papists. Such writing as this indicates only the sore and angry feeling of a narrow mind. Dissenters may wish to bury their dead in the parochial cemetery, either because there is no other burial-ground in the vicinity\*, or because it is 'the place of their fathers' sepulchres,' or because they have already a grave or vault there belonging to them. It matters not *why* they wish it: the only proper question is, On what conditions ought they to be at liberty to bury there? It

\* 'They suffer no grievance; they are not compelled to bring their dead to be buried by us,' says the Ex-Fellow of All Souls. This is, in many cases, contrary to fact.

may be that the family of the deceased, though Dissenters, have no objection to the burial service, and are quite willing that the parish minister should officiate ; but he refuses, on the ground that the deceased was not baptized, taking that opportunity of offering an insult to the rites and ministry of Dissenters, in a manner the most adapted to wound the feelings of the bereaved family. It is true, the validity of Dissenting baptism has been judicially sanctioned by the highest authority ; yet, still we find it vexatiously litigated. Or it may be that the deceased belonged to a denomination practising only adult baptism ; and that he had deferred conforming to the rite, through some conscientious scruple, possibly from some doubt as to the binding nature or perpetuity of the obligation, or through unavoidable delay. Well, the clergyman refuses to perform the service : will he not then allow the Dissenting minister to officiate ? No, a stern and insulting refusal is returned. The grave may be opened, and the dead may be interred, provided the charges and fees are paid ; but the churchyard belongs to the Episcopal sect, and for any minister of another communion to pronounce a prayer over a grave in that consecrated spot, would be a daring infringement upon the rights of the clergy ; nay, Dr. Burton says, it would be a glaring violation of the liberty of conscience ! ! ' Burial,' remarks the Ex-Fellow of All Souls, ' is the right of common humanity ; *Christian* burial can only be claimed by those whom the Church has agreed to consider worthy of it.'\* Nevertheless, it is claimed, and the Church dares not refuse it, on behalf of the most profligate and profane. We do not wonder that this writer should think that the clergy have more cause than the Dissenters, to complain in this matter ; being ' placed, ' by the law as it now stands, in respect to burials, as they are ' in respect to marriages, under the most painful and distressing ' circumstances.'

' It falls to my lot to have had experience on this point. For, having refused to perform the burial service in a case where every feeling of religion revolted from such a profanation, I was threatened with actions in the Ecclesiastical Court : and though I have letters of approbation from not less than four bishops before whom I laid the case, in which my conduct is styled correct, conscientious, and canonical, my counsel

---

\* The framers of the burial service, it is maintained, ' intended it only for *communicants* in the Church, who alone, up to that period, were entitled to the honours of Christian burial.' Now the Dissenters not only are *not* communicants, but ' the Church, in her Canons, plainly declares them to be, as long as they continue Dissenters, excommunicated persons.' (p. 7.) No Dissenter, therefore, can be considered by the Church as ' entitled to the honours of Christian burial.'

in that Court seemed to entertain no doubt, that if the cause had come to trial, which, but for the mismanagement of the other side, it would have done, sentence would have been given against me; and for my strict fulfilment of the intention of the Church, and adherence to the letter of her rules and instructions, and conscientious discharge of the solemn engagement which I was compelled to enter into when I became a minister, I should have been disgraced by sentence of condemnation; and, if a poor man, inconvenienced, if not ruined for life, by the heavy expenses to which I should have been put. . . . Bestow not, then, my Lords and Gentlemen, all your compassion upon the Dissenters who, for want of greater cause of complaint, are straining at a gnat; but *have some for the ministers of the Church, who are compelled to swallow a camel.*' pp. 30—32.

But, if the clergy choose to swallow camels, whom have they to thank but themselves? This ground of just complaint is but one of the blessed fruits of the union of church and state, the alliance of the spiritual and secular arm, the so-called National Establishment. We wish with all our hearts that the clergy were relieved; but they are not taking the proper course to obtain redress, by withholding the claims and making light of the grievances of the Dissenters.

The claim of admission to the privileges of the national seminaries, this Writer seems to think the most unreasonable of all. Like Dr. Burton, he can neither understand the ground on which Dissenters rest their claim, nor the process by which they expect to gain admission. Both writers deny that they are national seminaries: they are just as private as any Dissenting academy! 'It is idle, and worse than idle,' says the Canon of Christ Church, 'to talk of Parliament interfering to throw the Universities open to Dissenters.' 'The Colleges will set Parliament at defiance, and laugh to scorn the impotent attempt at persecution'!! There is no arguing with men in this fiery mood, and we shall therefore defer till another opportunity what we have to say in this matter.

We now come to the last grievance,—liability to the payment of church-rates and ecclesiastical demands. Upon this point, the Ex-Fellow of All Souls starts a curious difficulty, which he gets over, however, quite to his own satisfaction. Were these payments *voluntary* on the part of the Dissenters, it would be quite incorrect for the Church to receive them!!

' If the payment of Church-rates by Dissenters could be looked upon in the light of an *offering* to the Church from those who refuse to communicate in it, I conceive the objection in the matter ought to come from the Church, as the primitive discipline forbade the clergy to receive into the treasury of God's House the offerings of excommunicate persons, which our Church in her canons plainly declares the Dissenters, as long as they continue such, to be.

' An *offering* from the Dissenters it clearly is not; as they only pay

it upon compulsion. In what light then is it to be regarded? Simply, I conceive, as an offering from the king, who is a communicant, or from the nation, of whom about nine-tenths profess to worship God according to the true religion, as taught by that branch of the Apostolic Church which has been thus far established among us. This consideration may serve, at once, to remove all scruples. All that *we* need look to, is the character of the offerer; and as long as the king is a communicant in the Church, and the vast majority of the nation profess to adhere to it, so long, in the strictest accordance with the primitive discipline, we may continue to accept the offering; and when this ceases to be the case, it is not probable that our self-denial will be put to the proof. On the other hand, all that the Dissenters have to look to, is the character of those who demand the money from them, who are the civil governors of the country, who, according to God's Word, which the Dissenters profess to receive equally with ourselves, have authority to take custom and tribute.' pp. 7—10.

This is too amusing to excite any angry feeling; nor is it worth while to bestow a word upon the Writer's blundering assumptions, that might ruffle his serene self-complacency. Dr. Burton meets this 'demand' of the Dissenters in a much more liberal spirit.

' If allusion is intended to the payment of church-rates, I am very much disposed to think that the demand is just. If a person is not a member of the Church of England, I can hardly think it right to make him pay for the repair of the fabric, or for any of the appendages of a worship in which he takes no part. I am aware, that there is a practical difficulty in admitting this doctrine: because, when the churchwarden goes to collect the rate, it holds out a pecuniary inducement to every person to say that he is not a member of the Church of England; and thus not only will many parish churches go without repair, but hundreds and thousands of persons may be tempted to tell a falsehood in a matter of religion: it will in fact be a man's interest (in a worldly sense) to attend no place of public worship.

' I have sometimes thought, that the legislature might reasonably call upon every person in the country, who is now liable to be rated to church and poor, to pay a small annual rate (and it need be but very small) to the maintenance of some place of public worship. It would hardly be intolerant in a Christian legislature to require that every person in the country should declare himself to belong to some form of Christianity. In parishes where there are no Dissenters, the whole of this rate would be expended, as now, for the repair of the parish church, or for uses connected with the ritual of the Church of England. In parishes where there are several sects, the money would be divided in proportion to the relative members belonging to each sect: and it might be made imperative upon each sect, as upon the Church of England, to appoint some responsible officer, who should account publicly for the expenditure of the money. If it should happen, that the Church of England or any of those sects did not want that exact sum in any particular year, I can see no objection to its being put by as a

fund in case of need: but the rate should be collected every year, and thus no pecuniary inducement given to any person to declare himself a member of the cheapest church. There may be difficulties in the plan, of which I am not aware; and I only put it forward to be considered by others: but at all events the payment of church-rates by Dissenters ought to be abolished. If they feel the payment to be a grievance, it is one.' *Burton*, pp. 25—27.

The Dissenters, however, must weigh well, Dr. Burton says, what they are doing, in seeking an exemption from church-rates. They must not thenceforward act as churchwardens; they will, moreover, forfeit their pews at church, if they have any; and we do not know what else beside. We think we can answer for them, that they will bear with becoming fortitude all the legitimate consequences. We will say no more, wishing to take our leave of Dr. Burton and the subject in no worse spirit than he has himself displayed in the closing paragraph of his pamphlet, which we must transcribe both in justice to the writer, and because it requires, from us, in conclusion, one word of comment.

' Whether the Church of England is left to legislate for herself, or whether she is still forced to submit to Acts of Parliament, her Ministers have one plain course before them, which is, to watch for the souls of men, as they who must give an account. If their great object is to spread the Kingdom of Christ, they will be as far from gaining that object by intolerance and violence, as by indolence and neglect. They will sometimes meet with Dissenters whose hearts are still untouched by the charity of the Gospel, and whose conversion is not to be effected by human means. But even such cases are not hopeless, if Christians will unite in prayer: and my knowledge of Dissenters leads me to say with confidence, that, for one instance of such deep and bitter hostility, we may meet with hundreds of persons who differ from the Church of England, but who feel towards her no ill-will, and would sincerely lament her destruction. The common object in which we are embarked, can never be injured by our being ready to give the right hand of fellowship to all who differ from us. The great principles of Gospel truth must not be compromised. The doctrines of Justification by Faith, and of Sanctification by the Spirit, must not be explained away, or reduced to a name: but while I think that the Church of England is most likely, by the blessing of God, to plant these doctrines in the hearts of men, I am not insensible that the Master may have admitted other labourers into His vineyard, to stimulate our exertions and re-animate our zeal. Churchmen and Dissenters may soon have to unite against the common enemy. We may soon have to answer the question, Who is on the Lord's side? And if my clerical brethren, who chance to read these pages, should remember any portion of them, I hope it will be the sentence with which I shall conclude; that if we wish our Church to prosper, we must be at peace among ourselves, and in charity with those who are without.'

We have taken the liberty of omitting the names of two individuals, which are very offensively introduced into this otherwise liberal paragraph. One is that of Mr. Faithful, the other that of Mr. Binney, who seems to be the especial object of Dr. Burton's splenetic aversion. Without descending to the blackguardism of the rabid Curate of Pudsey, who, at the name of 'the person 'Binney,' foams at the mouth, Dr. Burton is thrown by the same name into an agitation in which he loses the temper of a gentleman. We will not defend every sentiment or expression in the publication which has stirred up this bilious wrath. We will not conceal our regret that Mr. Binney should not have done justice to himself, by explaining more fully his meaning, and by guarding against those gross misapprehensions of his sentiments, which have led persons who have not the pleasure of his acquaintance to mistake altogether his spirit and character. We are persuaded that Dr. Burton would, as a Christian and a gentleman, feel ashamed of having so treated a faithful, laborious minister of Christ's Gospel, amiable and exemplary in all the relations of life, and far removed, in his taste and habits, from political contention or polemical strife. To the doctrines and formularies of the Episcopal Church, Mr. Binney is understood to have no peculiar antipathies, but, on the contrary, to dissent from them less decidedly than many of his brethren. And yet, he has recorded his solemn conviction, that the National Establishment, by confounding civil with religious obedience,—by encouraging a reliance for salvation upon a ritual regeneration, a sacerdotal absolution, and a Christian name,—by perpetuating those errors of Romanism so ably and fearlessly exposed by Archbishop Whately as still extant in Protestant creeds,—by obstructing and disowning an evangelical ministry, and by investing with the character and authority of public instructors, thousands of erroneous and unconverted ministers,—in short, by the shackles it has imposed upon the faithful ministers of the Church, and the unhappy secular influence with which it has armed the unfaithful,—has contributed more to ruin, than to save the souls of men. This may be a mistaken, an exaggerated estimate of the evils resulting from the system; but, if it be an honest one, and one that assuredly has *some* foundation, why is it to expose the person who gives expression to the opinion, to a torrent of obloquy such as might seem due only to a man who had been guilty of some glaring outrage or monstrous impiety? It is difficult to believe that those parties who now can do no worse than vent their wrath on 'the person Binney,' in words of contempt or bitterness, would not, had they the power of calling in the secular arm to aid the weakness of the spiritual, consign the Minister of the Weigh-house to the stake, the pillory, or the dungeon.

Art. II. *Europe during the Middle Ages.* Vols. I. and II. pp. 320, 354. London, 1833. [Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopædia.]

THE present state and prospects of European society can be understood only by one who has studied its incipient elements as developed in the history of the Middle Ages. Amid their darkness was fostered that giant superstition which cast the crowns of the monarchs of Europe at the feet of an Italian priest. The same portion of time witnessed the rise and growth of that political structure on whose ruins are based the several fabrics of European Government; and that historic night was vocal with the lays of those errant minstrels whose harps arrested the spirit of poesy in her flight from the uncongenial atmosphere of the barbaric court, or the cowled consistory. The consequences, too, of the irruption of the Scythic hordes upon the enervated subjects of a decaying empire, present a remarkable chapter in the natural history of man. The politician will draw lessons from the rise or fall of states and powers; the philologist will trace the formation of rude dialects into the polished tongues of modern times; and the philanthropist will rejoice as he watches the withdrawal of the veil of superstitious ignorance that so long overspread the nations of Europe, and the gradual dawning of the light of truth. So many and such different fields of study are afforded by the history of the Middle Ages, that to comprise the whole within the limits of two small volumes, seems a bold, if not a rash attempt. The extent of territory might not be so great an obstacle as would at first appear, since the research would commence by seizing the different points as they emerged from the inundation which had simultaneously overspread the whole. But while this would much simplify the undertaking, yet, when the several heads of religious, literary, and political history came to be divided and dilated on, the attempt would seem formidable indeed.

Formidable, however, as it may be, it is made in the volumes before us; and if the execution is in any respect unsatisfactory, great allowance must be made on account of the magnitude of the undertaking, and the nature and limits of the work. While we are aware that the size of a cabinet history must have fettered the author, we cannot but observe that he has increased his trammels, and contracted his field, by the divisions he has adopted. The space afforded to the different sections of the work, is often by no means commensurate with their relative importance. Thus, while 'Florence, Sienna, &c.' are despatched in less than nine pages, and Venice in thirteen, the Popes, ranked under the head of the 'religious and intellectual state' of Italy, occupy thirty-three; and the state of the Italian church, consisting almost entirely of the exploits of a list of Saints, extends to upwards of fifty. Of the entertaining nature of these miracles, there can be no doubt;

but, that the biographies of these canonized worthies should be entered into so minutely, while four of the first restorers of European literature are dismissed with a line a piece, is, we submit, just cause for complaint. Half of the second volume, devoted to the religious and intellectual state of France and Germany, is little else than a series of amusing biographies. All this is rather incongruous with the plan of an author who not unfrequently reminds us, that the 'vast range' under consideration 'must be "passed over with incredible despatch.' To crown all, our attention is directed to the fact, that in this, the fourth part of the whole work, exclusively devoted to the 'religious and intellectual 'state' of the two countries, the author has 'not even incidentally treated on the literature of Germany.' And, consequently, the omission is supplied by a 'lay' and a fairy tale extracted from 'Taylor's historic survey of German Poetry.' This is not what we should have expected from a writer of ability, possessing competent knowledge of his subject; and that the present author is such, the work affords ample evidence.

Nor is the corresponding portion of the history better performed, which describes the state of Italy. What can compensate for the Writer's neglect of her 'vernacular authors' who have a European reputation? Dante, for example, of whom M. Sismondi thus speaks:—'No poet had yet arisen, gifted with absolute power over 'the empire of the soul; no philosopher had yet pierced into the 'depths of learning and thought; when Dante, the greatest name 'of Italy, and the father of her poetry, appeared, and demonstrated 'the mightiness of his genius, by availing himself of the rude and 'imperfect materials within his reach, to construct an edifice re- 'sembling, in magnificence, that universe whose image it reflects. 'Instead of amatory effusions, addressed to an imaginary beauty; 'instead of madrigals, full of sprightly insipidity, sonnets la- 'boured into harmony, and strained or discordant allegories, the 'only models, in any modern language, which presented them- 'selves to the notice of Dante; that great genius conceived, in his 'vast imagination, the mysteries of the invisible creation, and un- 'veiled them to the eyes of the astonished world.'\*

To this regenerator of literature is afforded in the present volumes only the scanty notice:—'the sublime and terrific Dante, 'the greatest poet since the days of Homer!' The Author should have borne in mind that he was not writing for those who can peruse in the original the *Divina Commedia*, and who know that the genius of Dante trod other paths than those of poetry; but for those who would search, and vainly, in his narrative, for an account of that great man on whose death 'all Italy appeared 'to go into mourning.' Who would not value an account of these

\* Sismondi's *Literature of the South of Europe*, Vol. i. p. 366.

immortal 'vernacular authors,' (for Ariosto, Petrarch, 'and others,' are as unceremoniously dismissed,) above the prodigies recorded of St. Nilus or St. Peter Damian? Why should St. Catherine of Sienna have two pages and a half devoted to her, while Petrarch is passed over as having 'nothing but his versification to recommend him'? Why, in short, should the 'limits and disposition' of the Historian lead him to omit the vernacular literature of Italy and of Germany, while he loads and contaminates his pages with the worthless legends of monkish lore?

But that part of the work before us which lies most open to animadversion, is the fierce attack on the Albigenses. Those early dissidents from the Romish Communion, the Author characterises as 'sectaries who, under the general names of Vaudois and Albigenses, differed in some points essentially from each other, and had nothing in common beyond contempt for the superstition of the dominant church.'

'The former,' he proceeds to say, 'the Vallenses, (corrupted into Vaudois,) were so called from their residence in the mountains of Savoy, probably from time immemorial; the latter took their name from Albi, in the vicinity of which they flourished in most number. Of the Vaudois, with whom we have no present concern, it may be sufficient to say, that their tenets do not appear to have materially varied from those of modern protestants. Not so the Albigenses, who certainly held some at variance with scripture and reason; some, the tendency of which was to subvert the fundamental principles of human society. It may indeed, and with much appearance of reason, be urged in their defence, that the only account we hear of their opinions is furnished by their ruthless enemies. To understand the weight of this objection, let us hear the words of a contemporary, Peter, monk of Vaulx-Cornay; of one who was present among them, and who is the first chronicler that condescends to acquaint us with what we are so much interested in knowing.'

Well as we may understand the weight of the objection, we confess that we cannot understand the logic of the last sentence. To ascertain the degree of credit due to the Monkish writers, we are to appeal to those writers themselves. Ask my brother if I be a thief. Are we to believe the assertions of Petrus Monachus on the authority of the papal bull which asserted that the heretical Albigeois worshipped the evil spirit in the form of a huge toad? 'That the preceding description is in many points inaccurate,' we are told, 'is exceedingly probable, but the basis is too true.' Equivocal admission! Inaccuracy can scarcely be attributed to one who knew as much of the Albigenses as did (we are told) the Monk of Vaulx-Cornay. We must not be guided by referring to the ordinary rules of war, in a case where the assailant of schism is a minister of that church whose maxim it is to hold no faith with heretics. But even were the charges of the Monk indisput-

able, they would not bear out the assertions of the present Historian. Petrus Monachus intimates that there were several sects of the Albigenses. To how many of these does his description apply? Omitting what is evidently the head and front of the offending of these 'dissidents from the Romish Communion,' their identifying that corrupt church with the scarlet lady of the Revelations, and the setting at nought her sacraments, one might suppose that a covert satire was intended on those orders which were the pillars of the papacy. Is it not strangely inconsistent in a monk, to condemn the *abstinence* of 'the black-garbed prefect'? It strikes us too, that the silly anecdote related at p. 294, of the 'believer,' who received the *viaticum* from an Albigensian *consoler*, but died before he could recite the *paternoster*, is paralleled by the profane anecdote regarding a drowned monk, which is related at great length, and with no expressions of horror, at pp. 216, 7, 8, of vol. iv. of the History of Spain and Portugal, by the same author; not to mention numerous equally edifying facts in which that work abounds. Absolution was quite as readily accorded by the Romish *confessarius* as by the Albigensic 'consoler'; while the merits dispensed cost the former nothing, and the shriven penitent was none the worse off for the sin, prior or subsequent, of his ghostly father.

That the Albigenses may not have entirely escaped the corruption of morals and of doctrine that has in almost every age broken out in some form and in some part of the Christian Church, is by no means improbable. The Paulicians had, by the middle of the eleventh century, settled in the north of Italy; many of them had entered France and Germany; and it is very likely that they were the first who were known by the name of Albigenses. But this affords no ground for the summary condemnation of all the heretics who ranked under that name. Mosheim\*, who derives the appellation from the circumstance that the heresy was condemned in the council of Albi, says: 'There were several Paulicians among the various sects of dissenters from the Church of Rome, that inhabited the country about Albi; and it is also true, that the title of Albigenses is usually extended to all heretics, of whatever sect or denomination they were, who dwelt in those parts.'

The same able and impartial historian, after enumerating the chief tenets of the Paulicians, thus sums up:—'When we consider the corrupt state of religion in this century, and particularly the superstitious notions that were generally adopted in relation to outward ceremonies, the efficacy of penance, and the sanctity of churches, relics, and images, it will not appear surprising that many persons of good sense and solid piety, running from one

\* Ecclesiastical History, Vol. ii. p. 523, note.

‘ extreme to another, fell into the opinions of these Mystics, in which, among several absurdities, there were many things plausible and specious, and some highly rational.’\*

It would thus appear, not only that the Paulician heresy itself was by no means the system of impiety and immorality described by the Monk of Vaulx-Cornay, with whom, in the main, the present Historian appears to agree; but that the charge against the Albigenses in general, of entertaining Manichæan doctrines, is by no means warranted by fact. How far then, let our readers judge, is the Writer of the history before us justified in indulging in such a tirade as the following?

‘ Such were the Albigenses. That they were not Christians, that they were worse than Mohammedans, that they rejected not only what is common to Roman Catholics and Protestants, but even what the Arabian impostor himself sanctioned,’ (what?) ‘ must be evident to every man who is diligent enough to seek for truth, and honest enough to confess it. \* \* \* \* \* Let us not forget, that if they assailed the superstitions, they also rejected the essentials of Christianity,—every thing which, if we believe in the scriptures, we *must* consider holy; that they were blasphemers, perhaps even idolaters. Whether their morals were as low as their doctrines were abominable, we do not wish to decide; but we may observe that morality could scarcely exist with such opinions. However this be, one thing is unquestionable; that it was the duty of the civil powers to put them down, not by fire and sword, but by persuasion—by the arguments of the clergy; and if those failed, they might have been banished into some Mohammedan country. \* \* \* \* \* It is lamentable to see with what pertinacity even men from whom greater sobriety of judgment might be expected,—a Sharon Turner or a Gilly, incline to a sect which has no claim on our favour beyond that of pity. That the church of England should contain within her bosom so many admirers of fanatics who denounced not only the hierarchy, but the sacraments and institution of priests; that any Christians should advocate the cause of men hostile to Christianity itself, may, (might?) indeed, surprise us, if we did not know that it is easier to utter preconceived opinions than to wade through hundreds of ponderous folios. \* \* \* \* \* He who sincerely endeavours to dissipate, however vainly, long continued error, has some claim to indulgence, even when he forsakes, for a moment, his proper path of investigation.’ Vol. i. pp. 300, 1.

By no means. The opinions of an author lose all value the moment they cease to be supported by calm and dispassionate investigation. The doctrine of religious persecution is distinctly countenanced in this passage, which plainly indicates to what ecclesiastical school the Writer belongs.

It is with pleasure we turn from the fiery polemics and monastic legends which occupy the religious and intellectual departments

\* Mosheim, *Ecclesiastical Hist.* Vol. ii. pp. 527, 8.

of the narrative before us, to those parts of the work which are devoted to the civil and political history of Europe during the Middle Ages. In these, the Author displays both skill and research, and has given us the result of fair investigation. Hallam has, perhaps, been drawn upon somewhat more largely than is distinctly acknowledged ; but there is no deficiency of original manipulation.

One of the chief objects of interest in that part of European history which is comprised within the limits of the middle ages, is the cause of the different proportions in which political power was shared between king and nobles, in France and Germany. Reared by the same great hand into one empire, these two countries had no sooner fallen to other rulers, than the causes began to operate, which rendered the German dependent on his peers for his elevation to the throne of the Cæsars, and enabled the *Dei gratiâ* monarch of France to dispense with any such assistance in regulating the affairs of his kingdom. In the latter country, the name of royalty was nearly all that remained to be usurped by Hugh Capet. The sceptre of Charlemagne had dwindled to a shadow. The frequent partition of the royal power and domain, the imbecility and debauchery of the greater number of the kings of the Carlovingian and Merovingian dynasties, had made the way easy for the encroachments of the vassals. A few great nobles, among whom the Sire de Couci displayed on his banners the proud disclaimer of royalty\*, had parted out the kingdom between them. This high noblesse looked on with more indifference than indignation, when the Count of Paris united the crown to his hereditary fiefs, rather than the fiefs to the crown. Nominal recognition was the utmost accorded to the first of that line of kings who occupied the throne of France till shaken from it by the revolution ; and, in the south of France, even nominal recognition was denied. There, the style of charters ran, instead of in the king's name, *Deo regnante, rege expectante*, or, *absente rege terrena*\*. The throne gained little accession of power until the time of Philip Augustus. His politic and wary intellect seized on a happy conjuncture of circumstances, and the result was the commencement of the ascendancy of the crown over the aristocracy. The very contest which gave to England Magna Charta, helped to raise the throne of Louis XIV. Far-fetched or paradoxical as this may seem, it is nevertheless fact. The struggles between John and his barons, made Normandy an easy prey to the French king. The example thus made of a royal vassal, not less than the actual importance of the forfeiture of this ducal fief, strengthened, in no ordinary degree,

\* 'Je ne suis roi, ni prince aussi.  
Je suis le Sire de Couci.'

† Vaissette, quoted by Hallam.

the hands of Philip, and laid the foundations for that continued aggrandisement of the crown, which, at last, degraded the nobles into the mere intriguers of the palace. The royal power, thus raised from the dust, scarcely paused in its career, till a date beyond the termination of the middle ages beheld it reach its zenith, decline, and fall.

The Germans commenced their separate history by the deposition of their 'royal log', Charles the Fat, in 887, and the election, in his room, of Arnulf, Duke of Carinthia, a natural shoot from the Carlovingian stock. On his election, the Author observes,

'the great feudatories of the empire were, the Dukes of Saxony, Thuringia, Lorraine, Swabia, and Bavaria, besides numerous counts and lords of the marches. Dependent on it, also, were not only the Kings of Burgundy and Provence, but even that of Moravia, a prince who, like his subjects, was of Slavonic descent and language. Hence the empire was almost as extensive in the ninth century as at any subsequent period. If the eastern frontier, Moravia and Silesia, were occupied by a different people, and if several tribes were virtually independent, its extension into France must be admitted nearly to counter-balance that disadvantage. Of those tribes, by far the most formidable was that of the Obotrites, who inhabited Mecklenburg, and against whom Arnulf had little success. To secure the friendship of Zwentibold, King of Moravia, Arnulf gave him the ducal fief of Bohemia, which was also inhabited by Slaves; but this policy had an effect opposite to that which he intended. Zwentibold, thus strengthened, revolted. In revenge, Arnulf had recourse to an expedient still more censurable,—that of allying himself with the Huns, whom he drew into Germany, and with whom he marched against the Slaves. If he triumphed over the enemy, he had the mortification to see a great part of Moravia joined to a part of Dacian Thrace, and made to form the new kingdom of Hungary. This savage and warlike people were much more to be dreaded than the Slaves, whose power had been thus injudiciously weakened. But if Arnulf was thus unfortunate in his policy, his reign was not without glory: he was the first Christian prince that triumphed over the Scandinavian pirates; a people who, under the denomination of Northmen, or Normans, were laying waste the maritime regions of western Europe, and the interior of France. Like his Carlovingian predecessors, he received the imperial crown from the hands of the Pope: but his connexion with Italy was unfortunate; for, though he was acknowledged by a portion of Lombardy, he lost both blood and treasure in acquiring a vain honour.'

Vol. II. pp. 92, 3.

This sketch of Germany at the election of Arnulf, exhibits powers vested in the Emperor that he was not long suffered to wield. At this time, and during the ascendancy of the House of Saxony, the right of lineal succession appears to have been recognized; and, though a formal sanction seems to have been judged necessary, the crown was, where circumstances allowed

it, as strictly hereditary as that of France or England. The coronation of our kings, and the election of a Germanic emperor, have their origin in the same principle of recognition by the States. The power, moreover, displayed by Arnulf in his disposition of fiefs, was very much greater in degree than that enjoyed by subsequent monarchs. How soon the imperial prerogative was curtailed, we learn from our Author.

‘Before the close of the eleventh century, we read that the emperor could no longer confer a ducal fief, or elevate a count to the dignity of prince, without the sanction of a diet. Without the same consent, he could not pardon condemned nobles, nor enjoy their confiscated property, nor alienate any portion of the imperial domains. His judicial authority was no less circumscribed, since the ecclesiastical dignitaries exercised the high and low jurisdiction with the same plenitude of power as the secular feudatories. But we find that, if his power was decreased, his title gained in dignity. Previously to his recognition by the pope, he did not assume the imperial title: on his election, he was styled *king of the Franks*, sometimes *king of the Lombards*, often *king* only. Henry II. appears to have been the first to assume the more magnificent style of *king of the Romans*: this, added to the still more splendid appellation of the *holy Roman empire*, shews the anxiety with which the emperors wished to be regarded as the successors of Augustus. Three royal vassals, the kings of Denmark, Poland, and Bohemia, might well nourish their pride: if one of these happened to be present, he bore before the sovereign the imperial sword of Charlemagne, with which every royal investiture was made.’

Vol. II. p. 105.

We are inclined to agree with our Author, in attributing the continued diminution of the power of the Germanic sceptre to ‘the concessions of the emperors themselves, who, when anti-‘Caesars were in the field, (and this, during the latter part of the ‘twelfth, and the beginning of the thirteenth centuries, was gene-‘rally the case,) never hesitated to concede what was demanded ‘of them.’

In attempting to account for the advance or retrogression of the royal power, we must bear in mind, that the king and the noble are, in this early state of society, alone to be regarded. The people were not to be thought of. The serfs or *ingenui* of the feudal ages could never interfere in the quarrels of their lords, either with each other or with the paramount. Obedience was the duty of the vassal; and it appears to have been a point contested by the sovereign, that his person should be sacred from the attacks of his feudatories. At the time of the height of the feudal system in France, this point was not ceded. A law of Frederic Barbarossa, and the custom of some parts, declared that to follow the immediate lord in war against the king, was not part of the allegiance due from a vassal.

But there is, perhaps, hardly enough light thrown upon the subject, to allow the comparison between the two branches of the

empire of Charlemagne to be pursued as it deserves. To endeavour to trace from the eighth and ninth centuries the evanescent empire of Napoleon, and the yet existing one of Francis, might be thought too bold, or too fanciful.

The extracts we have given, we consider as a fair sample of the style and character of the work. It is not free from faults and inaccuracies of expression, but they appear in some degree the consequence of haste. In taking leave of our Author, and recommending his volumes, we must advise him, when he again ventures into the field of history, to take more time, and put less faith in his monkish authorities. It is but justice to him to say, that the original portions of his work are those to which most frequent reference will be made, while the adventures of the saints will serve only to amuse an idle hour.

---

Art. III. *Narrative of a Tour in North America*; comprising Mexico, the Mines of Real del Monte, the United States, and the British Colonies: with an Excursion to the Island of Cuba. In a Series of Letters, written in the Years 1831-2. By Henry Tudor, Esq., Barrister at Law. In Two Volumes, small 8vo. Price 1*l.* 1*s.* London. 1834.

M R. TUDOR tells us, that he undertook the voyage across the Atlantic 'for the purpose of re-establishing a state of health somewhat impaired, as also of visiting the only quarter of the globe which he had not seen.' In former times, a man who had seen the four quarters of the globe, would have been deemed a traveller of no ordinary enterprise; but, thanks to steam and other modern discoveries, it is now a mere excursion of pleasure, to make the tour of the Mediterranean, or to perform the over-land trip from our Eastern possessions, taking Egypt and Greece in the way home. It is difficult for an Englishman to strike out any route, indeed, in which he shall not find himself forestalled or overtaken by his countrymen. The Alps are overrun by English tourists; and those who wish to be exclusive, must betake themselves to the Himalaya. Every body goes up the Nile: in order to make discoveries, an adventurer must take Ethiopia in the rear, and make for the Mountains of the Moon; or ascend the Shary, and try to reach Lake Fittre. A fortunate person is Lieutenant Barnes, who has been the first to explore the valley of the Oxus. China, before long, will open practicable routes to enterprise; and then, our travellers will be ready to wish, with Alexander, for another world to conquer.

A tour in North America cannot promise much novelty. Judging, indeed, from the reports of our travellers, North America, as a country, presents little that is worth visiting or describing; for their narratives are almost uniformly filled with statistics,

political discussions, anecdotes of men and manners, comparisons between the old and the new country, advice to emigrants, &c., &c. :—all very good in their way, but not the picturesque and agreeable sort of information which we look for in travels. We should exceedingly like to see a volume of travels in the United States, in which there should be neither praise nor blame of the Americans and their institutions; nothing about Auburn Prison, or the Erie Canal, or the Capitol, or New Lebanon—nothing about camp-meetings, or even slavery; but simply an account of what there is to be seen in the works of the Creator, in the phenomena of the material universe. Surely there must be something worth crossing the Atlantic to visit, besides Niagara and the Natural Bridge. The Americans themselves, Mr. Tudor agrees with Captain Basil Hall in stating, are by no means such lovers of nature as the English; and it would seem as if most of their visitors catch the mercantile, matter of fact, political spirit of the people.

Mr. Tudor, however, appears to have made, as he says, '*la belle nature* the object of his search'; and he parted company with an amiable family with whom he was pursuing the high route from New York to New Orleans, in order to visit the Weyer's Cave, distant about twenty miles out of the road; his fellow-travellers being content, for the sake of saving two days, to leave all the wonders of Virginia to the admiration of the stranger. We shall reward Mr. Tudor, and gratify our readers, by extracting his description of this magnificent cavern.

‘ The morning was fine and warm, though now the middle of November. My road lay for seven miles through the depths of an extensive forest, where the majesty of the trees, the ever-changing objects of the continually meandering path, and, in addition, the deep solitude, unbroken by the song of a single bird, or the appearance of a single human being or human habitation, conspired to raise an interesting excitement of mind. Every thing was silent as the grave—a desert wilderness reigned around, with a hushed and mysterious solemnity. And yet the same Spirit, I could not help ejaculating to myself, that “moved on the face of the waters,” breathes o'er the pines of this forest, and rustles through its falling leaves—

‘ “ Since God is ever present, ever felt—  
In the void waste as in the city full—  
And where He vital breathes there must be joy.”

‘ Emerging thence, I came in sight of a long and waving line of the mountain-ridge which I had so lately passed, and that forms such a prominent and untiring object in the landscape. The features of the country were altogether changed from what I had hitherto observed. I was now in what is called the Valley of Virginia, and found the land to be as fertile and well cultivated as it had previously been the reverse. Rich and smiling farms were scattered about on all sides,

displaying at once the bounty of nature and the diligent care of the provident husbandman. This luxuriant tract continues, with but few intervals of inferior soil, throughout the entire length of the valley, extending a considerable number of miles, as far as the romantic junction of the Shenandoah and Potomac, at Harper's Ferry.

The Weyer's Cave presents the most extraordinary, splendid, and beautiful subterranean exhibition that is perhaps to be seen in any part of the world. The countless myriads of stalactites and petrifications, of every size, form, and colour, from the purest white to the darkest green and brightest vermillion, and from the dimensions of an organ to those of an icicle, exceed all that can be imagined. Many of the numberless chambers contained in it, of which one or two appear nearly as spacious as Westminster Hall, are literally hung round with these glittering spars, presenting, in various places, the most picturesque and fanciful drapery of petrified and transparent substances, and reminding me, from their gorgeous appearance, and the situation in which they were beheld, of the magical halls of an Arabian enchanter.

Having procured a guide, and a number of boys to carry torches, I entered this fairy palace just as the moon was softly brightening over the blue mountains, which might now have well changed their denomination from blue to silver, as the former was absorbed altogether in the flood of radiant light that was poured down upon them. The entrance to this laboratory of Nature, where she works in silence and secrecy, producing the most enchanting forms and devices, lies on the precipitous side of a hill. It is excavated by an unknown and inartificial process into a thousand chambers and galleries, extending to a length of upwards of half a mile, and of very considerable breadth. Indeed, many of its caverns and recesses have never yet been explored; and those which are known require a conducting thread to guide the adventurer, as much as did the celebrated Cretan labyrinth of ancient story.

The chamber which is first entered is called the "vestibule,"—being bound, as a faithful narrator, to attend to the classical nomenclature of the place,—and whence you proceed, through a rock of petrification, to the "Dragon's Room." Here are perceived numberless and varied formations of stalactites, and a huge, outlandish figure of the same material, emblematical of the poetical personage that gives to the apartment its designation. Winding along a narrow gallery, the exploring visitor descends, by a steep ladder at its extremity, into what is denominated "Solomon's Temple," where is beheld a sublime and extraordinary sight, worthy of the illustrious title by which it is named. On one side is exhibited an immense, wave-like incrustation of the most beautifully white and transparent petrification, extending from the ceiling to the floor, representing a cascade falling over a precipice, and appearing to have conglaciated in the very act of descent. This is fancifully termed the "Falls of Niagara;" and, associated as it is with the hidden depths of the subterranean world, and lighted up alone by the flickering and lurid glare of torches, impresses the imagination with a sentiment of wonder and superstitious awe. The effect was truly magical and full of interest. Turning to another side

of this marvellous cavern, is seen "Solomon's Throne," elevated to a height, and thrown into a shape, well becoming the imaginary chair of state of a sovereign prince, and forming one entire mass of glittering crystals. Near to it stands "Solomon's Pillar;" while in an apartment adjoining are beheld ten thousand stalactites suspended from the roof, of various spiral forms, and of a perfectly white colour, called by the anti-poetical name of the "Radish Room."

Proceeding onward, through a long and winding passage, you ascend, by another ladder, to what has received the name of the "Tambourine, or Drum Room;" decorated with a splendid drapery of crystal workmanship, and semipellucid curtains of different hues, spread over the walls like the embellishments of a lady's drawing-room. These were truly admirable; some of them forming, in the loveliest white spar, the appearance of canopies, and others falling in ample sweep from the ceiling to the floor, and exhibiting as graceful and softly flowing shapes as so many folds of silk. Here are displayed immense sheets of congelations, called the "drums," which, on being struck, emit a sound resembling that of a gong. On leaving these instruments of unearthly melody, threading other galleries, and surmounting "Jacob's Ladder," you pass through the "Senate Chamber," and the "Music Gallery"—each presenting a diversified array of gorgeous gems of superhuman fabric—into "Washington's Hall," the most splendid and extensive chamber of the cave. The dimensions of it are very considerable, being ninety yards in length, twenty wide, and fifty in height. The spars and crystal formations of this room, if so it may be called, are particularly brilliant, the roof being apparently supported by musical columns ranged along its sides, and which, by passing a stick rapidly over their surface, produce a profusion of singular intonations like a ring of bells. "The Father of his Country" is here mounted on a superb pedestal of the same transparent mineral, exceeding in brightness the lustre of Parian marble, and might be supposed a second Rhadamanthus, descended to the shades below, to administer the impartial justice which he taught and executed in the world above. It struck me that these hints of popular feeling, addressed to the memory of the great hero of the Revolution, might act as a gentle reminiscence to the senators of a country that he formed, and over which he presided with such devoted patriotism, that the vote which was passed in congress two years ago, to raise a monument at Washington in honour of its first and most illustrious president, remains to this day a dead letter on the journals of their proceedings.

Out of respect to the late President's wife, I must not omit to mention what is called "Lady Washington's Drawing-room," in which is displayed a variety of the most fantastical and beautiful drapery, of a bright green colour, edged with white, and hanging in the form of curtains. At a short distance from this, with very appropriate coincidence, lies the "Diamond Room," well deserving its title from the extreme brilliancy of its spars, and their close resemblance to those costly ornaments. Continuing my researches, I now passed successively the "Pyramids," "Pompey's Pillar," and the "Falls of the Ganges;" and came, at length, to one of the most gorgeous specimens

of petrifaction in the whole cave, standing in "Jefferson's Hall." It is formed of a massive body of spar that would probably weigh many hundred tons, and is decorated with the most graceful and regular flutings, covering its entire surface. This is denominated the "Tower of Babell," and is, without the slightest exaggeration, a truly magnificent piece of natural crystal workmanship.

Passing a very fine incrustation of a silvery brightness, resembling the new moon,—being elevated towards the ceiling, and producing an optical delusion highly interesting,—I now scaled the rugged and slippery rocks of the "Giant's Causeway." The object that I proposed to myself, as the reward of my toil, was to see the "Statue of Buonaparte," beheld by very few in consequence of its difficult access. This circumstance has operated greatly in its favour, since, by being seldom touched, or tarnished by the smoke of torches, it preserves all its original splendour of colour, and presents a snowy whiteness and brilliancy of spar exceeding all the rest. In this respect, it was a matchless specimen of the purest and most beautiful crystallisation.

But it is high time to pause in my description, though I have not given you more than a tithe of the wonders of this gorgeous cave, and which infinitely surpasses every thing of a similar nature that I have ever seen elsewhere. In point of interest, though not similarity, it forcibly recalls to my remembrance the superb caves of Ellora, on the plains of Hindostan, in which India's ten thousand gods are enshrined in colossal stature. You may imagine the absorbing delight that I took in this subterranean research when I inform you, that I remained gazing and exploring for five hours, to the no small surprise of my guide, who told me that few remained so long or penetrated so far. I entered the cave about seven in the evening, after riding twenty miles, just as the lovely moon was throwing her "silver mantle" over the sombre screen of the blue mountains; and when I came out, her glittering orb had passed the zenith and was fast declining to the western hills. The only apprehension I entertained, during my visit to these darksome regions, was the fear of our lights going out; a circumstance that was nearly occurring two or three times, when it would have been, I think, physically impossible to have extricated ourselves from the endless galleries, traversing each other, in which we were involved—more intricate, I should imagine, than even the celebrated labyrinth of Dædalus.' Vol. I. pp. 457—465.

The Natural Bridge has been often described; but we must insert the Author's account of a singular phenomenon in the heart of the Alleghanies, and of the magnificent scenery with which this part of the 'backbone of the United States' abounds; the only drawbacks upon which are, the villainous roads, and the Kentuckian bipeds, in comparison with whom, Mr. Tudor says, 'a wild Indian, a good, honest Hottentot, or a plumed savage of 'Otaheite, would be gentlemanly society.'

The "beau morceau" of this romantic mountain-chain was, the White Cliffs on the River Kenhawa, that flows, for a number of

miles, through a profound and most picturesque ravine, bounded by tremendous precipices, and beautifully wooded banks, till it reaches the Falls to which it gives name. Hence it is precipitated over a foaming cataract, and, winding along, is lost amid the defiles of the mountains. This is, perhaps, the most imposing landscape of the whole of the kingdom-like state of Virginia. Here, as throughout these Alpine regions, all was wildness—woody wilderness—sterility—and silence, broken, alone, at the latter place, by the noise of the rushing waters.

Having passed a number of salt-manufactories, established on the Kenhawa, we arrived at what is called the “Burning Spring,” the surface of which, several yards in diameter, was agitated by a continual bubbling, occasioned by unremitting exhalations of gas. Alighting from our vehicle, we beheld the singular effect of its inflammatory nature. A cottage girl, living close by, having brought a piece of lighted paper, applied it to the surface of the water, which put it, instantaneously, into a state of ignition. The flaming gas spread in every direction, like burning brandy, and presented the extraordinary appearance of the water itself being on fire. The exhibition was highly curious and interesting; for though I had seen in Italy burning spires of the same subtle element, issuing from crevices in the earth, yet I had never before witnessed the effect of its illuminating qualities produced through an aqueous medium.

Our route, for the last twenty-eight miles, lay principally through the depths of extensive forests, crowded with a gigantic growth of trees, of enormous size and girth, that had withstood the shock of a thousand wintry storms, and appeared to defy the power of the uplifted axe to dissever their mighty stems. Our road, if so it could be called, was a continual meander through the accidental interstices of this woody labyrinth. At one time we were jolting over huge roots of trees that threw their fantastic ramifications across our path—and, at another, wading a river, on which it was almost doubtful whether the coach was floating or still rolling onward. At last, after a hundred hair-breadth escapes from being overturned, we reached the lovely banks of the Ohio; having been two long weary days and a half in passing over 160 miles of ground, of the very worst description, in many parts, that was ever trodden by horse or man. I need hardly inform you with what delight I hailed the termination of my journey, and my deliverance from the human Pandemonium of evil and lawless spirits in which I had been “hard bound in misery,” if not “in iron.” I had now gratified to the full, and for ever, my unlucky desire of seeing a specimen of the “half-horse and half-alligator;” and felt quite satisfied that the *original* animal would have proved a much more bearable companion than the copy I had just seen.”

Vol. II. pp. 19—21.

Let no man say, however, that he has seen the worst of human nature. Kentuckian manners cannot, perhaps, be exceeded in gross vulgarity; but our Traveller had to learn from painful experience, that there are social evils worse than the *ne plus ultra* of gross manners. From New Orleans, he proceeded to Havanah,

where a residence of upwards of a month convinced him of the utterly demoralized state of the laws and institutions of that colony.

‘ You will think it incredible, when I tell you, that the very forms of justice—so called by a misnomer—actually encourage, instead of checking, the commission of crime, by offering impunity to offenders, to the precise extent in which witnesses are deterred from coming forward to give evidence against them. Can you conceive any thing so destructive of justice, and so confounding of the distinctions of right and wrong, as that the *witness* and the *felon*, the *violator* of the laws and the *supporter* of them, should be *both* sent to the *same common prison*, to await there the day of trial, as if both were equally guilty? And yet, I have been repeatedly assured by the most creditable persons—merchants and others—that such is positively the fact. What is the motive for this extraordinary practice I could never learn; but the consequence is but too obvious and alarming; namely, that no one, with the tender mercies of a jail before his eyes, will acknowledge that he knows any thing whatever of an offence committed, though it took place before his very face. The hair-dresser who performed his office upon me the second or third day after my arrival, (modestly charging me a dollar, or four shillings and sixpence, for his condescension,) frankly confessed to me, that if, on leaving his house, he should see me on the point of being robbed or *murdered*, on the very threshold, he should *instantly close the door, and leave me to my fate*; in order to prevent the certainty of his being *imprisoned*, as a *future witness* against the robber or assassin who was taking my purse or my life. A similar unhappy and desolating policy prevails throughout—at home or abroad. Should the case occur while passing along the streets, the startled eye-witness of a deed of blood, instead of rushing to the assistance of the wretched victim, with the feelings of humanity common to the savage as to the civilised man, would turn aside his view, and hurry along, for the purpose of escaping that incarceration which would be the penalty of his kindness.

‘ Turning our consideration from the corporal penalty to the pecuniary one, in the case of a prosecution for robbery, or otherwise, the same corrupt and outrageous system prevails, and compels the sufferer, though fully acquainted with the offenders, and possessed of overwhelming evidence for their conviction, to forego what in other countries would prove a remedy, but in this would only occasion an additional misfortune. To give you a single instance: it was declared to me, by a respectable gentleman, that a merchant of the city had, on one occasion, his “store” or warehouse broken open in the night, and various articles of merchandize stolen from it, to the amount of two thousand dollars. The fact coming to the knowledge of the police, the property was traced, and the thieves apprehended. The officers came to his warehouse, bringing with them a portion of the goods they had seized, and which the owner immediately recognized as his own, but as positively denied that they belonged to him. The policemen asserted his ignorance to be impossible, as the robbers had confessed that they had taken the articles from his premises. The merchant, however, stoutly persisted in his denial of the stolen property, and de-

sired them to take it away, and dispose of it as they chose, inasmuch as it formed no part of what he had lost ; and thus terminated the affair. The wily, but sensible tradesman knew full well that, though large the amount which he was doomed to suffer, the *first* loss was the *least*—much less than what the harpy hand of the law would have imposed upon him—being aware that, in prosecuting for the recovery of his two thousand dollars' worth of merchandise, he might have expended in addition *two thousand more*. Thus much for the law of Havana !

‘ In civil, as in criminal suits, the same principle—or, I should rather have said, the want of it—leads to similar results. The bringing of an action frequently entails ruin ; inevitably, I understand, where the resources are small, and but too frequently where they are considerable. The length of the cause is made to depend on that of the purse ; for when the one becomes *empty*, the other is speedily *terminated*. The consequence, therefore, is, that to avoid the necessity and danger of bringing an action, and for the sake of preserving his purse from the gripe of the law, the merchant gives no credit beyond three or four days, or a week. A general distrust pervades the various orders of society. *Not a single banker* is to be found throughout the whole of this highly commercial city ; into the harbour of which enter, annually, between one and two thousand trading vessels, and where exists a population, including the suburbs and transient residents, of nearly 150,000 inhabitants. How the immense traffic is conducted, which is evidently carried on at Havana, is best understood by those concerned in it. Every merchant is, of course, obliged to be his own banker ; and, at a considerable risk, and with much anxiety, to keep in his counting-house a larger or smaller amount of cash, in proportion to the extent of his dealings. It appears to me, that the yellow fever, bad as it is, may be considered less prejudicial to the interests of the town than the weakness and imbecility of those who sanction or permit the continuance of a system so utterly subversive of law, morality, and religion.’

‘ That I had remained sufficiently long in Havana, you will readily admit, when I assure you, that, three or four nights prior to my departure, *fourteen assassinations* were committed in various parts of the city ; one of the murdered persons, a Frenchman, being the friend of a gentleman living in the same lodging-house with me at the time it occurred. Though most of these miserable victims were, I believe, Spaniards, and natives of the island, yet one of my own countrymen, Mr. John Davidson, of London, had a narrow escape with his life, in consequence of neglecting the wholesome advice of the Spanish consul at New Orleans—not to walk in the streets after dark. It appears that my compatriot, with whom I have the pleasure of being acquainted, was amusing himself, while sauntering along the streets in the dark, by smoking a cigar, when he was abruptly accosted by a Spaniard, of athletic and suspicious appearance, with a request to lend him his cigar with which to light his own. During the operation, which was unusually long, the stranger produced as vivid a glow as he possibly could, while, at the same time, his eyes were directed with a scrutinising glance on the features of his supposed victim. When he

had thus made his observation he returned the cigar, accompanied by this rather startling remark—" You may now pass on, sir—*your cigar has saved your life—you are not the person I am looking for!*" It is needless to say that the shuddering traveller did pass on, and rather more quickly than he had advanced ; and was happy to find himself once more in safety, within his apartments at the hotel, where he could enjoy his amusement without the disagreeable addition of having six inches of cold steel plunged in his bosom.'

Vol. II. pp. 107—11 ; 146, 7.

From Cuba, our Traveller proceeded to Vera Cruz, at that time the head-quarters of General Sant' Anna ; and thence, not without hazard, ascended to the table-land of Mexico. Nothing can more strikingly indicate the moral state of the country, than the fact, that for seventy miles, between Vera Cruz and Xalapa, on the high road from the principal port to the capital, not a field in a state of cultivation is to be seen ! The state of the laws and of society in Mexico, is not much better than at Havana itself ; and the curiosity of our Traveller was somewhat dearly paid for, by an inconvenient detention, from which he with difficulty obtained his release. We must pass over his description of the Mexican capital, to make room for his account of the pyramids of Teotihuacan, nine leagues from the city. They disappointed him.

' Expecting to find something of resemblance of those I had seen in Egypt, I was so far deceived, in this respect, that it required a particular position whence to behold them, united with some little *faith*, in order to discover the pyramidal form at all. They bear not the slightest similarity to those of Africa ; and though declared to be artificially formed by the Aztecs, whereon to erect their altars and perform their religious services, yet the immense bulk of the hills, as such in fact they appeared to be, as well as the aspect of them altogether, seemed to destroy the belief that they were of human formation. It is true, that on many parts of the ascent masses of stone and other materials, strongly cemented together, announce the devices and workmanship of man ; but on penetrating this exterior coating nothing further was perceptible than a natural structure of earth, similar to that of hills in general, plentifully scattered over with loose stones. The idea that struck most of the party, and was afterwards confirmed by an American engineer, who had made extensive experiments in excavation on each of them, was, that advantage had been taken by the original natives of naturally formed eminences, ready prepared for their fanatical purposes, which they had cut into a square shape, and had faced in part, or perhaps wholly, with a covering of stone-work. On this point Baron Humboldt expresses a doubt as to whether they were entirely constructed by the hand of man, or whether the Toultees took advantage of some natural elevation, which they covered over with stone and lime.

' That these mounds, or *soi-disant* pyramids, were appropriated to the ceremonies of religion, and to superstitious worship by the Aztecs,

there can be no doubt, from historical details which have been given of them, as well as from the ruins of what may be considered temples existing on their summits. The largest of them, called Tonatiuh Ytzaqual, signifying, in the Indian language, the "House of the Sun," was consecrated to the honour and worship of that luminary; having a base, according to Dr. Oteyza, a Mexican gentleman who measured it, of 682 feet, and a height of 180; though certainly appearing at least double the altitude of his statement. The other, which is much smaller, is named Metzli Ytzaqual, or "House of the Moon," and rises to a perpendicular height of only 137 feet. In passing, as well as in ascending them, with the exception of the partial stone-work alluded to, you would suppose them to be what I believe they actually are—common natural hills, on which have been raised artificial structures of paved terraces, staircases, temples, and altars. To these has been given a square form, dignified by the name of pyramid, and which can only be distinguished from certain points of the compass. The two principal pyramids are surrounded by a number of smaller ones, dedicated, according to tradition, to the worship of the stars, but which are supposed to have served as tombs for the dead; the entire plan having been designated, in the Aztec language, by the name of Micaotl, or "road of the dead."

"The prospect from each is, however, truly beautiful and magnificent, and whence are beheld the extensive plains of Ottumba, to which, as previously mentioned, Cortez retreated after the memorable *noche triste*; and where, surrounded by a host of exasperated enemies, he fought the desperate battle that at length terminated in his favour, by his boldly seizing in person and carrying off the royal standard. The country presented a most interesting landscape of haciendas, churches, cultivated fields, and a richer embellishment of trees than I had witnessed in any other portion of the valley; while the towering giants of the Andes, girding the plains in circular phalanx, seemed like so many protecting genii of its security and peace. During our ascent and descent of these pyramidal hills, we were encompassed by a crowd of Indians, offering for purchase numbers of grotesque idols, which they had dug out of the smaller mounds." Vol. II. pp. 277-80.

How Mr. Tudor found his way back to the coast, and effected his escape; and how he reached New Orleans, and thence steamed it up the Mississippi and the 'pure and crystal course of the lovely Ohio', to Cincinnati, where Mrs. Trollope set up a bazaar, which failed, and put her out of temper with the Americans; and how he proceeded thence to Washington, and heard some of the orators of Congress declaim on the Tariff question; and then, returning to New York, made an excursion to Massachusetts, and finally left New York for England;—the reader will learn from Mr. Tudor's agreeable volumes, of which he has sufficient specimens to induce him, probably, to wish to see more. We cannot, however, resist the temptation to transcribe the portrait of President Jackson.

‘ We were still more surprised with the appearance of our illustrious host on entering the apartment. The general rose very graciously from between his two friends to receive us, with a little tobacco-pipe stuck in his mouth, about four inches in length, which, with all the unaffected simplicity of a second Cincinnatus, he was smoking, in order, perchance, to drive away the cares of state, or at least to lighten their weight. Though perfectly aware of the unostentatious character of republican manners, we were somewhat staggered at the sight of so truly humble and unpretending an instrument between the lips of the political head of the confederation. Had it been an Indian hookah, a Turkish or German pipe, or a roll of pure Havana in the shape of a cigar, our surprise would have been perhaps but slightly called forth, knowing the tobacco-loving propensities of the worthy citizens in general ; but its quality and remarkable shortness, united with the person, place, and dignity, excited considerably our admiration. The pipe was, however, instantly removed, and placed on the mantel-piece to fume itself out at leisure, while we were politely invited to be seated.

‘ There is something imposing in the figure and aspect of the president, who is of lofty stature, and exhibits a form attenuated to an extreme degree of thinness. His visage is long, covered with wrinkles, expressing a gravity and sedateness almost approaching to melancholy, and bearing the strongest marks of hard service and wasting care to which the vicissitudes of his active life have exposed him. In point of personal demeanour, his address is courteous and dignified ; and I could not but feel a sincere respect for this veteran champion of his country’s rights and independence, who had equally signalised his bravery and martial skill on various occasions requiring the greatest presence of mind, unflinching fortitude, military tact, promptness to plan, and daring resolution to execute.’ Vol. II. pp. 468—470.

The popularity of this personage is, after all, to us a little inexplicable. He is the creature of party, of a party that wanted a daring, pertinaciously resolute leader ; but he owes his elevation and success to circumstances, more, we apprehend, than to his personal qualifications.

Art. IV. 1. *Christ Crucified.* An Epic Poem, in Twelve Books. By William Ellis Wall, M.A. of Trinity College, Oxford. 8vo., pp. xvi. 515. Oxford, 1833.

2. *Messiah’s Kingdom.* A Poem, in Twelve Books. By Agnes Bulmer. 12mo., pp. 486. London, 1833.

WE have repeatedly taken up these volumes with the intention of qualifying ourselves to give judgement upon their respective merits ; but our courage has failed us at the sight of the interminable continent of verse which opened before us. Twelve

Books ! To think of a master of arts (the art of poetry does not rank among them) or a female votary of the Nine, setting about an epic poem in twelve books at this time of day ! Can it be the successful daring of Robert Pollok that has emboldened the authors of these productions to try their hand and tempt their fate ? If so, we have perhaps something to answer for. But poetry is not just now in season. These are not the piping times of peace. Polemic warfare is raging ; political interests that come home to every man's business and bosom, engross all the attention that can be spared from the immediate concerns of daily life ; and it is well if the Bible itself be not pushed aside for the newspaper. Under such circumstances, poetry is apt to seem, to the majority of persons, little better than elaborate trifling. Or, if her 'soul-subduing voice is heard,' like that of 'gentle Pity,' in the intervals of stormy passion, it must be in familiar and favourite strains, that waken old associations, requiring no mental effort, but soothing the intellectual power with their music.

If any new poetry could hope to please, and to please permanently in the present day, it would certainly be religious poetry ; for we are not among the number of those who deem sacred themes unsusceptible of poetic embellishment or of the eloquence of verse. When the poet's lyre is the poet's heart, and a high moral purpose is the inspiring impulse, religious subjects and feelings are above all others the fittest materials for almost every form of poetry—except *epics*. The time for epics is long, long gone by.

It may be so, perhaps we shall be told, with the undiscriminating, vulgarised many ; but epic poets, especially those trained in classic bowers, write only for the discerning few. Mr. Wall has evidently aimed at no middle flight, but has aspired to revive a species of composition that we had supposed to have shared the fate of Bucolics and Idylls, Masques and Mysteries. In his preface, he remarks, with reference to the machinery introduced, that 'the spirit of the *Epopœia* is breathed into it by supernatural agents, and our mortal productions are by these means animated with Promethean fire.'

'An epic poem without machinery, would be merely a versified history ; a frigid body devoid of an inspiring soul ; and, like the snow-formed effigy of the false Florimel, or the waxen image of witchcraft, must fade and dissolve, when placed in contrast with the ancient narrative muse, glowing with the full heat and brightness of her divine light. That machinery, therefore, has been adopted, which forms a part of Christian theology, has been consecrated by the successive and uniform usage of the Christian poets, and is in strict conformity with the principles of the *Epopœia*.'

The 'uniform usage of the Christian poets' resolves itself, we apprehend, into the examples of Tasso, Milton, and Klopstock,

and their imitators. Referring to the first two, Mr. Wall remarks, that 'the modern supernatural mechanism of the Christian epic has been in some measure adumbrated from its Pagan prototype.' This is true; and the impropriety is akin to that which has embodied so much of paganism in the ceremonial and pageantry of the Romish Church, and canonized under other names the demons of the old Pantheon. But the machinery of the Christian epic, Mr. Wall remarks, 'actually forms a very considerable and important part of the Scriptures; and it is, therefore, to those sacred sources that the obligations of all the Christian epic poets are principally due.' He flatters himself, moreover, that he will be found, 'on *Scriptural* authority, to have carried this supernatural agency into poetic operation further than has hitherto been done,' and 'to have presented it in new points of view.' He refers, of course, to the ministration of angelic beings. Now, we must at once say, that no usage, no poetic authority, not even the glorious sin of our own Prometheus, never to be successfully repeated, not even by himself,—can, in our judgement, sanction or warrant the *pagan* use of Christian machinery, or, in other words, the fictitious introduction of supernatural agency as mere machinery. If an epic poem cannot be constructed without this unhallowed blending of truth and falsehood, then a Christian Epic is a contradiction in terms. It would be easy to shew, that *Paradise Lost*, though not unexceptionable in this respect, is still taken out of any general rule by the predominant character as well as surpassing excellence and sublimity of the poem; and yet, that its machinery is, in many parts, its great flaw. But, passing by this grand exception, we must maintain, that so to confound and mix up the objects of faith with the creations of fancy, is to impair the very foundations of rational belief, and, in the same way as idolatrous representations operate, to substitute the religion of imagination for that principle which alone connects the heart with the things that are unseen and eternal. The distinguishing character of Christian belief is, that it relates to pure truth, and rests upon certain evidence. The belief of classic heathenism was not even professedly founded upon any species of evidence, nor was truth an object even of inquiry. Their poetry and their religion were derived from the same source, and made of the same materials; and they bowed down before the creatures of their own imagination, as they worshipped the more palpable work of their own hands. But imagination is excluded from the religion of faith. To believe with the heart, and to worship with the spirit, are operations of mind not only distinct from that of re-embodimenting the conceptions derived from sensible things by an effort of imagination, but incompatible with it. The spiritual act cannot be assisted by the fancy; and not only so, it is interrupted and

precluded by it, so that where superstition, the religion of imagination begins, faith, the religion of the heart terminates.

These remarks are intended to be of general application, but they seemed to be called for by the Author's defence of his machinery, apart from the manner in which he has employed it. Of this, we shall now proceed to give a specimen.

‘ Image of God on high ! created once  
In brightest dignity, and fram’d to shine  
Insufferable splendour ; now, though fall’n,  
Intensely keen, intolerably bright.  
At his right hand sate Death, and on his left,  
His best belov’d, pale Sin her treach’rous form,  
Mincing her gait, uprais’d ; whereat all, mov’d  
To love and dalliance, sigh’d their am’rous vows.  
Light breathing aspiration, as the soft  
Whispers of zephyr, heighten’d to a blast  
At length ; or voice of many waters, heard  
Falling down hills, and babbling to the rocks—  
‘ He waved the silence sign ! The streams of Hell  
Forget to roll ; Cocytus instant checks  
His lamentations ; Phlegethon her flames  
Enwraps within her bed ; the Stygian waves  
Smooth o’er their pitchy face ; th’ infernal winds  
Forget to roar, or blow their blast around,  
And softly slow in solemn sighs expire.  
Then, hush’d all Hell, her horrid Chief began—  
“ Angels ! immortal denizens of Hell ! ” —p. 27.

The imitation is palpable enough : it was perhaps inevitable. In the second book, Satan is represented, agreeably to ‘ the machinery ’ of the book of Job, as presenting himself in heaven on ‘ the great anniversary ’ of the first day of creation.

‘ Now tow’rds the mount of Heav’n, supernal throne,  
The holy hill, and tabernacle, he bow’d ;  
Sorrow himself, where all around was joy !  
Here God’s immediate presence pours above  
A double day ; a radiance that outshines  
Earth’s sun ; as he in his meridian blaze  
Surpasses Phœbe’s light ; from sky to sky  
Roll nobler orbs, reflective through these climes  
His emanative light, essential day :  
The radiant Deity himself the Sun  
Of this supernal universe of joy !  
Here clouds on clouds roll awful, and around  
Veil the excess of light ; which else intense,  
(For light is but the shade of Deity,)  
So brilliant and pure, might kindle Heaven  
With its own rays, and blind e’en seraphs’ eyes.  
Behind it, pointed beams, intensely keen,

Diverging, silver each contiguous cloud ;  
So bright, that not the eye of seraphim  
The splendour can endure, but screen their orbs  
With their celestial wings, and friendly mists  
Oft interpose. Seven rainbows painted round  
The clouds of light ; seven mystic cressets burnt,  
Blazing like suns at noon, before the throne,  
The seven spirits of God. A sea of glass  
Like unto crystal, purest stream of life,  
Fronting reflects their rays ; whose gleaming banks  
Shadow'd the tree of life, which bare its fruits,  
Twelve species wondrous, monthly ; and its leaves  
Teem'd with the healing pow'r of life to man.

‘ At awful distance, round about the throne,  
Sate four and twenty elders, rob'd in white  
Vestments, resplendent ; bleach'd so wondrous fair,  
As fuller ne'er could white them ; on their heads  
Bright crowns of gold they wore : cherubic shapes  
Give adoration ; and the holy quire  
Mystic, unanimous their voices raise,  
In never-ending melody, that rest  
Nor day nor night ; “ Hail ! holy, holy Lord  
“ Almighty ! past, and present, and to come,  
“ Worthy all glory, honour, thanks, and power,  
“ For ever and for ever living life !  
“ Thou hast created all things ; and for thy  
“ Pleasure, benevolent to created being,  
“ Thou all things mad'st, Jehovah ever blest !”  
Then cast their crowns of gold before the throne,  
Submissive kneeling ; and with holy lips  
Worship th' Eternal Parent of all being.

‘ Myriads of sainted spirits stood around,  
Lower gradation, in the second Heav'n ;  
With num'rous golden lyres, that aid the hymns  
Of the seraphic throng. With horror thrill'd,  
Satan approach'd, nor near presum'd t' advene,  
For nought could now his fading form endure  
Light so intolerable ; the gleaming throngs  
Backward withdraw, and shun th' approach of ill.

‘ Now paus'd the golden lyres, and ceas'd the hymns  
That ravish'd Heav'n, when from th' excess of light,  
The tabernacle of glory, forth proceeds  
The voice of God, in gnarring thunders breath'd,  
“ Satan ! whence comest thou ? From errand bad  
“ Doubtless ; for ever versant in all ill ?”  
To whom the Pow'r of Evil thus replied,  
Standing abash'd in presence of his God :  
“ From walking to and fro in Earth I come,  
“ Observant of thy votaries and mine,  
“ Reviewing life in all its chequer'd scenes,  
“ And evil I discern without my care.” pp. 61—64.

Here, again, we more than question the legitimacy of this epical license; and we consider its tendency as positively injurious. The use which is made of the hieroglyphic language of the Apocalypse in the above passage, shews, too, the absurdity of attempting to present as pictures, those symbolic representations which, like those of heraldry, or like the figures of arithmetic, are addressed purely to the understanding, and are essentially *unimaginable*. For example, the four living creatures which are referred to under the term 'cherubic shapes,' are clearly symbols of the general church,—mystic insignia as intelligible to the understanding, and as unintelligible to the fancy, as the sphinx, the minotaur, or the hydra of antiquity, or the griffin, the red lion, or the bicipitous eagle of modern heraldry. Now the whole of the scenic and symbolic 'machinery' of the Apocalypse is of this peculiar character. That is to say, taken literally, it is absurd; and it is designed to be thus incapable of a literal meaning. The scenes and objects are such as could not possibly have been described to the imagination, and they are therefore so described as to keep the fancy in abeyance, and to defy the power of conception. Thus it is remarkable that the personal appearance of Christ is described in terms that could not be rendered into the sensible language of picture. Transfer it to the canvas, and every one would perceive, that the robed form with hair white as wool, eyes of fire, feet of brass, a sword proceeding from his mouth, and seven stars in his right hand, was a representation of high significance, but which the imagination could not possibly deal with. To transfer, then, such representations to poetry, and to convert hieroglyphics into machinery, is a palpable blunder, and, considering the sacred nature of the subject, a most unhappy one.

In the tenth book, we are introduced to epical embellishments of a different character, but not more consonant with scriptural truth. 'The supposed visit of our Lord to the spirits in prison, a notion originating in a misunderstanding of 1 Peter iii. 19, is thus narrated :

‘Along the verge of Fate’s terrific gulf,  
On Hell’s dread side, extensive climes expand  
Darksome; where spirits of the Gentiles dwell,  
In prison-house of ignorance and grief!  
Remov’d from vales of punishment, as far  
As northern regions from the southern pole.  
Around the clime circles a triple zone  
Of brass, of iron, and of granite rock;  
In mural pride the barriers of the plains,  
Crown’d with cherubic scintillating fire.

‘On adamantine posts the valves of steel  
Are hung; and brasen bars and tortur’d iron  
Close the dread gates. So vast their strength and pow’r,  
Not all the force of fire, storms, tempests, winds,

Nor Heaven's ordnance, if discharg'd from cloud  
Electric, could burst ope the solid doors.  
The bolts infrangible their station keep,  
With instinct fraught ; shapes tutelar the gates  
Blazon'd ; with fierce and writhen brands involv'd  
That need not fiery food nor breath of winds  
To wake their flame. Fears and vindictive wrath,  
And winged blasts, the spacious entrance guard.

‘ In front a vast portcullis, of the weight  
Of worlds, prevents approach or near access  
Tow'rd the grim gates : cherubie forms stand by,  
The watchful guardians of this prison-house.  
Here absence from harsh suff'ring, but no bliss  
Is found : here reason, ever-doubting, walks  
In darkness, and in shadows of Heav'n's truth !  
Here in strict equity (for infinite  
Justice must equitably act) the lots  
Of purer heathen spirits were dispos'd,  
Till the joy'd advent of the Virgin Seed.  
Here heathen souls just measure now receiv'd,  
To necessary penal pains foredoom'd  
Never ; but, weigh'd th' allotments of their light,  
And how on Earth they liv'd ; not yet what faith  
Profess'd, when faith was not, and truth unknown  
The natural adorers of Heav'n's God,  
Prime Cause of Causes, Jove, or Jehovah, call'd !  
But mercy shewn and just allowance made  
For ignorance not wilful ; prais'd th' attempt,  
Though misdirected, t' honour Heaven's great Sire.  
Here too the savage (who the law ne'er knew  
Of God, and could not err against a law  
He knew not) found admittance, when his deeds  
On Earth conform'd to what to him was law ;  
The justice and religion which they held,  
The gods they worshipp'd, and the rites they paid.  
Thus, in these prison regions of the dead,  
The pious pagans here an entrance find  
To ease comparative ; though far remov'd  
From bliss of Israel's sons, who kept their law ;  
Nor ampler fields to range permitted yet.

‘ Here in superior order'd honours dwelt,  
Sages of Greece and Rome, philosophers ;  
Improvers of life by arts, and countless tribes  
Of virtuous legislators ; bards divine,  
Who taught and sang of virtue to their means  
Of knowledge : just as reason's lamp (supplied  
Not yet with revelation) shot its beams  
Faint through the moral darkness of the world.  
Thales, the key-stone of th' Ionic sect,  
Who, ere the rule of Christ shone bright in gold,  
“ To act tow'rd others as ourselves would wish

“ Responsive deeds tow’rds us ; ” its negative,  
 Abjuring wrong to others, found and taught,  
 Five circling centuries ere Christ was born.  
 And he who near to Christ’s morality  
 Drew, and for virtue’s sake the hemlock bowl  
 Of death drank off, as quaffing endless life,  
 Wise Socrates ! who taught that God was pure,  
 Omniscient, and from crimes and vices free,  
 That stain’d the pagan deities ; his care  
 Over created being, pleas’d with good ;  
 That wrong would wrong not justify, and Conscience,  
 The daemon of the soul, ill deeds reprove.  
 And Plato, whose excursive mind divine  
 Soar’d, ere his death, to distant spheres and climes  
 Of spirits good and evil, to unfold  
 Worlds now invisible to human ken.  
 With those, who rein’d men’s lives by useful laws ;  
 Draco severe, whose code was writ in blood ;  
 Rigid Lycurgus, sapient Solon found,  
 By Lydia’s king, wise sceptic of inconstant  
 Fortune ; with judges great and good, who laws  
 Administer’d with even-handed justice.’

\* \* \* \* \*

‘ Soon as approach’d Messiah, th’ orient rays,  
 Shot from his form divine, blaz’d through the dark,  
 T’ illumine with its beams of truth the clime :  
 The mists dissolving fly, and, thinner grown,  
 Darkness to light refines, soon as it felt  
 The rays of truth. So from the vexing furnace  
 The molten silver leaves its dross-dim ore,  
 And pure emerges from the finer’s fire.

‘ Now to the gates the shadowy squadrons press’d  
 In thick’ning throngs, a wretched captive crew ;  
 Long patient, long expecting the approach  
 Of the Redeemer ; whose long rumour’d fame  
 Had with the rays of hope their souls illum’d.  
 Enraptur’d at the beatific sight,  
 With suppliant palms they pray’d, and tears of joy.’

\* \* \* \* \*

‘ So spake the Man Divine with voice of God,  
 Loud as the thunder and the rushing winds ;  
 Hell felt the word, and, from her death-gorg’d depths,  
 Bellow’d her wrath, and stirs up all her dead !  
 Chieftains of Earth and Gentiles’ glorious kings !  
 Innocent babes ! Life old and young appears !  
 The clouds of night melt off, in silver day,  
 With lightning concussion, and such vollied roar,  
 That Hades, to her deepest abyss, shook.  
 Then ev’ry massive bar spontaneous flies  
 Open ; they feel arriv’d the fated hour,

And straight release the gates ! that bright, as th' orb  
Solar, th' eclipse slowly passing off his disk,  
Unfold, and liberate the sun-clad dead !

‘ The guiltless shining myriads come forth,  
As stars in number, and like brilliancy,  
When o'er the wintry sky of night they glow.  
Then impious deaths, that die beyond the grave,  
And all their cruel ministers, appall'd,  
Sudden withdrew, and down to deepest Hell  
Rush'd headlong, to pernicious night below.  
While loud the grateful throng of glitt'ring saints,  
As satellites around their monarch orb,  
Circling Messiah, thus his goodness laud.

\* \* \* \* \*

Now from the shores of Hell Messiah leads  
The souls redeem'd. They, as the silver train  
Of Vesper light, accompany their Lord,  
And o'er the hideous vacancy they fly.’      pp. 416—423.

Our readers will now be able to judge for themselves, both of the merits of those parts of the Author's epic upon which he appears most to plume himself, and of the general structure and execution of his versification. We purposely refrain from verbal criticism, feeling unable to bestow our approbation upon the plan of the poem, and the embellishments grafted upon the evangelical narrative. Even the facts recorded by the evangelists, become strangely betiseled in the poetic commentary. We shall give a single instance.

‘ Now with harsh agony convuls'd, his lips  
Parch'd with the drought of death, he cries, “ I thirst ! ”  
Swift at the word obedient they repair  
To th' urn that stood contiguous, and replete  
With water, and acetous harshest sours.  
Plac'd near the cross to quench the cruel thirst  
By pain induc'd, and by approaching death :  
Some in this acid potion sponges soak  
Bibulous ; which balanced upon hyssop reed,  
And rais'd aloft they to his lips apply.  
That hour the sacred oracle fulfill'd  
Once sung on th' holy lyre of Jesse's son,  
“ How they with vinegar Christ's thirst should cool ! ” ’

pp. 384, 5.

This is certainly not easy and harmonious versification, nor is it adapted, we fear, to please in other respects. Mr. Wall's intention appears to have been pious ; his talents, though not epic, may enable him to distinguish himself in other fields ; and we can assure him that we should have been happy to be

able to greet this his first performance with the encomiums he has so laboriously endeavoured to deserve.

Miss Bulmer's poem is *not* an epic. Her twelve books consist of an alternation of narrative and didactic, in heroic couplets, with lyrical interludes. The copious argument occupies ten pages, but may be thus summarily analysed. Book I. begins at the beginning—at the creation and the fall, and rapidly traces the history of our race to the call of Abraham and the trial of his faith. The next four books carry on the narrative to the Fall of Babylon. The advent, life, passion, and resurrection of Our Saviour, are the subject of Book VI. The next describes the nature, progress, and results of the Apostolic ministry. Book VIII. is occupied with the fall of Jerusalem and subjects connected with it. Books IX. X. and XI. take a review of Church history. The concluding book is devoted to the prospects of the Church.

The plan of the poem is so inartificial, that nothing more can be necessary than to present to our readers a few specimens of the diversified style, to enable them to judge for themselves of the merits of the execution. The lyrical episodes are, for the most part, somewhat too pindaric for modern taste; they would have pleased better in the days of Cowley. We prefer the simpler flow of such stanzas as the following.

‘ By the Spirit borne on high,  
Brought to Salem’s trembling towers,  
Prophet, pour the piteous cry.  
Lo, the insatiate sword devours !  
Lo, the fire of wrath Divine  
Kindles Heaven’s deserted shrine !

‘ From the infant’s moaning cries,  
From the mother’s anguish, wild,  
O, avert thy weeping eyes !  
Judah sinks in dust defiled,  
Jacob’s star in darkness sets,  
God his chosen race forgets.

‘ Yet amidst this dreary night,  
Lo, a fairer vision waits !  
Zion’s temple rises bright,  
Wide expands its spacious gates,  
To his consecrated shrine  
Mild returns the Guest Divine.

‘ On the altar’s hallow’d pile  
Fires, by heaven enkindled, glow ;  
Gushing springs of life, the while,  
From the sanctuary flow ;  
Higher rise, and broader sweep,  
Pour their fulness to the deep.

‘ Ocean, through its vast expanse,  
    Feels the vital influence spread ;  
Where the swelling floods advance,  
    Life and health their waters shed ;  
All within those depths that move  
    Glad their quickening virtue prove.

‘ Planted by Jehovah’s hand,  
    Fringing that immortal flood,  
Trees their beauteous boughs expand.  
    Such in Eden, erst there stood,  
Guarded by the seraph’s sword,  
    Now, for health, for life restored.

‘ Now restored to all mankind,  
    Stranger tribes with Israel come,  
Claim the lot by Heaven assign’d,  
    Seek in Canaan’s bounds their home ;  
Seek the covenant-blessing there,  
    Seek in Abraham’s grace to share.

‘ Strangers come ; those courts Divine  
    Open for all nations stand ;  
Offerings at Jehovah’s shrine,  
    Borne from every Gentile land,  
Fragrant, as from Israel rise,  
    Grateful, to the opening skies.

‘ Prophet ! though thy favour’d eyes  
    Gaze on scenes of distant years,  
Dim in vision’d mysteries  
    Though Messiah’s march appears,  
Yet his course is onward still,  
    Grace and nature work his will.

‘ Borean trumpets hurtling loud,  
    Lightnings in their fiery flight,  
Cherub hosts, or spirits proud,  
    Mortal or immortal might,  
Urge the wheels at his command,  
    Curb’d, confess his strong right hand.

‘ Earth, convulsed, in pangs shall reel,  
    Heaven before his presence flee,  
Death the grasp of Vengeance feel,  
    Hell its Judge in terror see ;  
Steadfast shall his truth remain,  
    Changeless his eternal reign.’      pp. 127—129.

As a specimen of the narrative portions, we take, almost at random, the account of the Transfiguration.

‘ His hour, his bitter hour of grief, drew nigh ;  
    His straiten’d soul, in prayerful agony,

Perceived its dread approach. Full oft he chose  
 The hours by nature given to soft repose  
 For solemn vigil on the mountain's height,  
 Where deep, unbroken Silence, and dim Night,  
 Witness'd, alone, his fervours. Now, to share  
 Their Master's glory, and to bend in prayer  
 With him before the Eternal, he invites  
 The favour'd three in whom his soul delights.  
 Pensive, yet pleas'd to share his grace, they climb  
 Rude Tabor's rocky height, and there, sublime,  
 Gaze on the ample heavens, whose concave bright  
 Glows, a pure canopy of circling light.  
 They gaze, adore ; their willing souls would rise,  
 But sleep steals softly o'er their closing eyes,  
 Exhausted nature asks the kind release,  
 And sweet he slumbers on whose soul is peace.  
 Not so the Master ; he, nor sleep, nor rest  
 Entices ; prostrate on the mountain's breast  
 He lies, in pleading prayer ; his soul, intense,  
 Breathes thoughts unutter'd forth. Omnipotence,  
 In its eternal altitude, till now,  
 Such supplication heard not. On his brow  
 Hangs the cold damp of midnight ; and his tears  
 Mingle with drops wrung out by griefs and fears  
 From the sad spirit's shrine. O mournful sight !  
 Ye stars ! ye angels ! on your thrones of light,  
 Veil your bright orbs in shade !

Lo, sudden streams,  
 Of purer lustre than intensest beams  
 Shot from the central sun, transpierce his frame.  
 His glistening raiment, his pure eye of flame,  
 Bespeak his pristine Majesty. Again  
 He looks triumphant down on grief and pain.

Heaven strengthens for its conflicts, not removes ;  
 The Eternal Father owns the Son he loves :  
 Celestial visitants descend to cheer,  
 Yet hold discourse on death and suffering near ;  
 And Moses and Elijah, from the skies,  
 Anticipate the accomplish'd Sacrifice ;  
 To Him surrender every sacred claim,  
 Absorb their glories in Messiah's name,  
 Acknowledge Law and Prophecy complete  
 In Him their end, their fount of radiance, meet ;  
 The servants to the Son their rule resign,  
 And, reverent, hail the holier Light Divine.' pp. 197—199.

We take our last specimen from the twelfth book.

‘ Earth, bound to sense and time, no wreath bestows  
 On hallow'd enterprise, whose ardour knows

No conflict but with adverse powers unseen ;  
She spurns its toils, accounts its triumphs mean,  
And, deep immersed in transitory cares,  
No sympathy with man, immortal, shares ;  
No lofty scenes attract her downcast eyes,  
No thought expands o'er human destinies  
Link'd with eternal life, or endless woe.  
Soldier of Christ ! her worthless crown forego !  
'Tis thine to bear the cross with Him who bled  
On its rude height ; who bow'd his suffering head,  
A Man of Sacrifice. 'Tis thine to share  
The martyr-spirit that transfix'd him there ;  
Like him thyself for others to forego,  
Detach'd from earth, and dead to things below ;  
Awake to Heaven's inspiring call alone,  
Blind but to splendours from the' Eternal Throne ;  
Purged from terrestrial dross, and prompt to rise  
In holy converse to the bending skies ;  
To catch from seraph-flames the glow of love,  
Swift, duteous zeal from angel-powers above ;  
Like them employ'd, bless'd minister of grace,  
On Mercy's errands to the wandering race.'

\* \* \* \* \*

' Soldiers of Christ ! ye holy men of prayer,  
Ye men of sacrifice, who noble dare  
The dangers of the field ! 'tis yours to see  
The present pledge of future victory ;  
In barbarous lands the primal spoils to win,  
From hell's dread empire, and the hydra sin ;  
Sweet sounds of peace through desert lands to spread ;  
To show the king of terrors captive led ;  
To bear triumphant from the monster's sting,  
Myriads of spirits thrall'd. 'Tis yours to bring  
The trophied shield, the conquering banner crown'd  
With earliest laurels, from the well-fought ground.'

' Won from the wastes of rude barbarian night,  
Such scenes of moral beauty bless the sight.  
Sin's deadliest haunts the gospel power assails,  
And, lo, the talisman of truth prevails !  
Detested demons quit their trembling prey ;  
In dust defiled deserted idols lay ;  
Man, grovelling, brutal, feels a sacred flame  
Inspire his kindling spirit ; generous shame  
For acts and thoughts of evil leads his soul  
To higher purpose, and the just control  
Of opening reason ; while the living light,  
Direct from heaven pour'd on his wondering sight,  
Discovers depths of guilt, and heights of grace,  
The destinies of Adam's deathless race ;

Transforms the slave of passion, vice, and crime,  
To bear, erect, the godlike port sublime ;  
To feel the high prerogative of mind ;  
To live a man, a blessing to his kind.'

pp. 439—446.

If this is not poetry of the very highest order, it is poetry that will please, and instruct by pleasing. We like the lyrical parts of the poem, upon the whole, the least; and should moreover have recommended Miss Bulmer to reduce her twelve books to six, by a mental process analogous to that familiar operation which reduces the quantity of a preparation, and at the same time increases its nutritive quality;—every lady will understand our figure. The Author apparently possesses a dangerous facility of composition, which is sometimes a great bar to the attainment of high excellence. Nevertheless, how inferior soever in machinery and all the requisites of the *Epopœia*, her poem contains so much that is admirable in sentiment, and often happy in expression, so much that will come home to the best class of readers, that we do not scruple to pronounce it worth a score of second-rate Epics.

---

Art. V. *Public Expenditure apart from Taxation*; or Remarks on the inadequate and excessive Pay of Public Servants. By Daniel Wakefield, Jun., Esq. 8vo. pp. xii. 281. Price 8s. London, 1834.

THE professed object of this volume is, to establish and illustrate the very important distinction between economy and retrenchment, and to shew the importance of a *due* proportion between pay and service, as a means to good government. ‘Starved service, whether its cost be great or little in proportion to the national wealth, is sure to be badly performed’; while extravagant pay furnishes the strongest temptations to incompetent persons to undertake duties which they cannot perform, and to the most competent persons to neglect the duties they have undertaken. Bad law-making is the result of extravagant pay; and the value of the golden mean in public expenditure appears when it is viewed, not as the effect, but the cause of good government. Such are the Author’s principles; and in dedicating his book to Joseph Hume, he compliments that ‘never failing advocate of retrenchment’, in language that might be mistaken for irony, upon his enlarged and philosophical views of fiscal questions. Those who accuse the Honourable Member of taking ‘a low, mean, shopkeeper like, two-pence halfpenny line in politics and legislation’—cannot understand that he should ‘look upon cheapness as a means to goodness in government’. Mr. Wakefield has endeavoured to point out some of the evils resulting

from too small an expenditure ; which, he trusts, will obtain attention from those who, 'irritated by the profusion of our Government, think that every saving must needs be good in proportion to its amount'. 'Economy, properly speaking, signifies a due expenditure, neither too much nor too little'. Granted ; but who shall determine what is too much or too little ? After going through all Mr. Wakefield's economical dissertations, his readers will find themselves at a loss, we suspect, not as to the truth of his axioms, which are as true as truisms can be, but as to the main difficulty in all such matters,—the *application* of right principles.

For instance, in illustrating the evil effects of underpaid service, in his first chapter, Mr. Wakefield contends, that the pay of soldiers and sailors is too low. Were their pay sufficiently raised, a different class of men would, he thinks, be attracted to the army, and the ranks would not be filled with the scum of society, as at present. Corporal punishment and impressment might then be dispensed with ; and all sorts of improvements would follow. In cases of emergency, almost every private would then be capable of performing the duties of an officer, as in the French army. But what that pay should be, which is to have this wonderful effect, we are not told, nor the principle by which its rate should be regulated. We should have supposed that the first step towards raising the character of the soldiery would be, to promote a better system of national education ; for to suppose that *any* pay would tempt a higher class in society to list into the ranks, or to volunteer into the sea service, is quite chimerical. Mr. Wakefield talks of 'the armies of countries superior to us in their mode of choosing and managing soldiers'. To what country does he allude ? To the Conscription of Napoleon, to the military despotism of Prussia, or to the beautiful management of a Russian army ? We take leave to question the correctness of his premises. The British soldier is not more absolutely 'a mere machine ' than the soldier of other nations.

Another class of underpaid servants is, the inferior clergy. Upon this subject, which is glanced at in the first chapter, and afterwards resumed more in detail, we find a great deal of undeniable truth, mingled with the same sort of sweeping conclusions, often based on mere assumptions, as those we have already adverted to. In comparing the English, Scotch, and Welsh clergy, Mr. Wakefield remarks, that 'the state of Scotland, where the clergy are moderately paid, has been pointed out with admiration by those *excellent men*', David Hume and Adam Smith ; to whose testimony may be added that of Mr. (now Lord) Brougham, whose speech as an advocate, *it is to be hoped*, expressed his then sentiments as a statesman. Here is his

‘testimony’, if such the clever and facetious remarks of the learned Counsel may be deemed.

‘Strange as it may seem, and to many who hear me, incredible, from one end of the kingdom (Scotland) to the other, a traveller will see no such thing as a bishop—not such a thing is to be found from the Tweed to John-o’-Groats—not a mitre, no, nor so much as a minor canon, or even a rural dean—and in all the land not a single curate—so entirely rude and barbarous are they in Scotland—in such utter darkness do they sit, that they support no cathedrals, maintain no pluralists, suffer no non-residence; nay, the poor benighted creatures are ignorant even of tithes! Not a sheaf, or a lamb, or a pig, or the value of a plough-penny, do the hopeless mortals render from year’s end to year’s end! Piteous as their lot is, what renders it infinitely more touching is, to witness the return of good for evil, in the demeanour of this wretched race. Under all this cruel neglect of their spiritual concerns, they are actually the most loyal, contented, moral, and religious people any where, perhaps, to be found in the world.’\*

To call this testimony or evidence, is ridiculous; and if it were all admitted, ‘it by no means follows,’ we are told, ‘that the clergy ‘ought not to have ample remuneration.’ Then what is ‘ample remuneration’, and what is the principle by which it should be regulated? Scotland, we are told, ‘furnishes a bright picture of ‘contentment and happiness from not being cursed with the ‘abominations of a bloated hierarchy’; but this bright picture is a little too highly coloured. Wales, however, on the other hand, ‘shews that parsimony in church affairs is nearly as bad as extravagance.’

‘From the poverty of the Welsh curates, this conclusion may also be drawn; that the high pay of the great dignitaries of the church renders them more deaf to the voice of moral equity, and more reckless of public scorn, than men of the same class in England, where the inferior clergy are comparatively better paid. All who have observed must have admired the patience, unwearied industry and strenuous efforts of many Welsh clergymen, with stipends not so large as those of game-keepers, in striving to perform the duties of their calling. If they do not perform them perfectly, the fault is not theirs. They do not perform them only because they cannot perform them. Whilst the range of their duties is very wide, and their parishioners are very numerous, their pay is only just sufficient to keep body and soul together. Nevertheless they labour, they strive and overwork themselves, whilst the fat and lazy bishop lolls his time away, or the thin and bilious one writes pamphlets, or makes speeches, in defence of every intolerant and uncharitable institution that may be threatened with improvement. Let us compare the position, character, and conduct of well endowed English

---

\* Trial of John Ambrose Williams for a libel on the clergy of Durham, Aug. 16, 1822.

clergymen generally with that of a Scotch minister or a Welsh curate. An English parson is a person with little more than a show of education ; for he who possesses only a smattering of classical knowledge, and a small admixture of mathematics, joined to total ignorance of every thing else, cannot be called well informed. Again, even the little that such a man knows, is rarely or never used for the benefit of his flock. Why should a clergyman exert his abilities, or display his knowledge in the composition of sermons, when they are to be bought at the price of waste paper ? The delivery of these sermons is almost the only communication that takes place between an English rector or vicar and his parishioners. Here and there, indeed, a rare man of a different stamp may be found ; but, of course, the conduct of the mass, not that of individuals, must be looked at on the present occasion. The reason why the English clergy have little or no communication with their parishioners is plain enough. The non-communication is caused by the absence of sympathy between the parties in question. This cause produces the same effect in other classes of society ; for when does intimacy subsist between men of a thousand or fifteen hundred, and those who have only a hundred per annum. Those who employ fashionable tailors, wear scented cambric, and ride on a hunter worth two hundred guineas, never have lived, and never can live, upon sociable, which means, equal terms, with the majority of mankind. If this be true of laymen, what is there in a parson's conduct to make those below him in respect of property, forget the difference between them ? Nothing ; but on the contrary, as the gorgeous clergyman calls himself the apostle of a self-denying religion, any man with a little common-sense, a brainless clodhopper, is struck with the contrast between precept and practice. Moreover, the practice is daily and hourly observed, whilst the precepts are delivered at intervals, few and far between. Once a week, perhaps, the clergyman delivers *ore rotundo* from the pulpit, a string of nicely balanced sentences on the duties of abstinence, charity, and constant prayer ; but, during every day of the week, and during almost every hour of every day, he presents himself a living proof of the neglect of all these duties. The morning ride or drive, with the well-groomed and highly-fed horses, the sumptuous table and peculiar claret, with a little quiet gaming, either at cards or billiards, in the evening, are frequent exhibitions in every parish in England, where there is a rich incumbent. How can poor people, or even people living in a moderate way, approach men who live thus ? ”

“ What a contrast is presented in the position, and therefore in the conduct of a minister of the Scotch church ! His house is not better, if so good, as the majority of those in his parish ; and his income, although enough to support him in decency, is so small as to forbid the slightest attempt at luxury or ostentation. Moreover, he is a man of sound and general information, and in many cases of rare acquirements and profound learning ; for unlike English parsons, instead of forgetting, he has added to what he learnt at college, not having had the means of wasting the best years of his life at Newmarket or on the Continent. His life is regular, sober, and cheerful ; and the equality of fortune with that of his parishioners, produces and maintains frank and cordial intercourse between them, such as is no where to be found

between the Land's End and the Tweed. Instead of going hunting, shooting, dining, or begging for preferment from a neighbouring lord or squire, a Scotch minister is assiduously employed in giving information, advice, and consolation to all who need his services. These are so useful, and are rendered in such abundance, that not a murmur or a cavil, on the subject of money, is heard from year's end to year's end. It would, indeed, be difficult to dispute on this head ; since no man can deny a right to a comfortable subsistence to another who earns it by the sweat of his brow.'—pp. 226, 230.

This representation overlooks entirely the actual condition of a majority of the English Clergy, the poorer incumbents and the half-starved curates referred to in a former chapter. Why compare the English parson with the Scotch minister or the Welsh curate, when such extreme inequalities may be found between the overpaid and underpaid of the same diocese ? The condition of numbers of the inferior clergy is thus depicted in the first chapter.

' There are many clergymen ready to run the risk of want, and undergo any labour rather than lead a single life. Those seek out an employment by which something may be added to their incomes, and when they think they have found one, marry. Whether their position be preferable to that of single wretchedness, is in some respects doubtful ; for nothing can be more pitiable than the state in which a married clergyman with a large family is too commonly placed. Born, perhaps, but always brought up as a gentleman, and anxious to bring up his family in the same way as people of his own rank, he is forced by poverty to resort to schemes and contrivances, generally ending by humiliating in public him whom they had previously humbled in his own opinion. The expence of feeding, clothing, and teaching five or six children, and of keeping up an appearance that will introduce them to the world in a manner becoming their station, is such as to make it difficult to conceive that all this can be done with an income of perhaps not £300 a year. Yet parish after parish in England and Wales, contains a minister of the established church who does it, albeit in order to succeed he is obliged to pass through what must be very painful to the mind of an honourable man. The worst part of the sufferings of clergymen in this position, perhaps, is caused by their neighbours, the rural aristocracy, whose profound respect for the established church as a body seems to be in the inverse ratio of their regard for needy clergymen as individuals. Indeed, if the story of the slights, the contumely, the affronts, and the persecution, endured by the vicar of Wakefield because he would not bow down before the lord of the manor, were properly studied by every father intending to make his son a clergyman, all who valued the happiness of their children would be deterred from the step. But the circumstances described by the genius of Goldsmith, so as to make one of the most affecting tales ever written, are rife enough now. A poor parson's children are contemptuously treated by lords and squires, and their daughters noticed, too often, only to be seduced, as they were in the time of Dr. Primrose. Indeed, the reality surpasses the

fiction, because, from the change of the scheme of society, and from the progress and diffusion of education, the degradation of a clergyman from following menial occupations, and his sufferings from seeing his children degraded, are infinitely greater than they were formerly. Married clergymen occupied by business are more incapable than unmarried men of efficiently performing the services for which they are paid. A married clergyman with several children, who engages in trading as a schoolmaster, or as a writer in magazines, or as a horse-dealer, farmer, or jobber, is so engrossed by the one idea of making "the two ends meet," that he can rarely find time for attention to his duties as a Christian pastor. This is clearly proved by the conduct of laymen obliged to live by the same species of exertion. Seldom indeed are they found with either leisure or inclination for any thing above the business of keeping their expenditure within their income. There are exceptions, in cases of men of extraordinary activity, who, by skilful management, may procure intervals of relaxation from such occupation; but even when a clergyman can accomplish this, is it natural that he should devote such intervals to the service of religion? On the contrary, it would be a miracle if he were inclined to do so, because the other portions of his time have been passed in a manner too repugnant to the doctrines and principles of his creed. Scribblers about party politics, keepers of boarding-houses for young gentlemen, constantly engaged in the higgling and bargaining of the market-place, and borrowers of money on annuity, cannot be expected to further the spiritual interests of the church, either by example or precept. They illustrate in their own persons the truth, that a man "cannot serve both God and mammon." Although some clergymen are able to increase their means of living by engaging in various undertakings incompatible with their profession, they are not always successful in them. Indeed, being unfitted from education and habits to compete with those who have been brought up to dealing, clergymen are at first losers, until practice has furnished them with experience in the art and mystery of truck and barter. A great number are ruined without gaining the necessary experience. The schedules of clergymen who have taken the benefit of the Insolvent Act, contain clear proofs on this subject. They exhibit the names of a large number of underpaid clergymen, who have been induced to engage in avocations that must have rendered them wholly unfit to perform their functions—that have turned divines into speculators and stock-brokers—and at last brought them to the bar of a court of justice. These schedules are excellent commentaries on the conclusion, "that underpaid service is very apt to suffer from the meanness and incapacity of the greater part of those who are employed in it." pp. 49—52.

We do not dispute the justness of this conclusion. We conceive it to be a great evil, that efficient labourers, who are worthy of their hire, should be underpaid. But, in addition to the difficulty of determining upon the golden mean, the question arises, By what system may we best guard against the two opposite evils? This is a point which Mr. Wakefield has not attempted to discuss,

and which, in reference to ecclesiastical pay, he merely glances at in the following sentences.

‘Without discussing the policy of maintaining a church for the purpose of upholding a particular creed, it may be remarked, that if the people provided their own religious teachers and preachers, as in America, they would probably be found more efficient than those belonging to an establishment forming part of the government. A political church, besides being a cause of jealousy, envy, and religious animosity of various kinds, presents obstacles to the adoption of a good mode of remuneration to its ministers which are almost insurmountable.’ p. 43.

Here the root of the evil is struck at. So long as an Establishment exists, with the system of patronage which is inseparable from it, the mischiefs of excessive pay without service, and the injustice of inadequate pay for excessive service, will be perpetuated in disgraceful combination.

Mr. Wakefield’s *principle* is, however, little more than a peg on which to hang his political opinions, which are those of a radical reformer of the Westminster Review school. He does not disguise his utter contempt for King, Lords, and Commons. An American President is ‘a useful public servant’ in his opinion, but ‘the excessive pay of an English King causes him to ‘be—any thing you please.’ The Chamber of Peers is represented as useless, and worse than useless. And the House of Commons is characterized in the following terms.

‘Our mode of doing legislative business, however, must be a subject of pity or indignation, rather than of wonder, to those who reflect on the wide difference of character between the makers of English laws, and those for whom the laws are made. No intelligent man can feel surprised that the majority of the house of commons does not sympathize, for instance, with the men of Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, or Leeds. These latter are men of business, active, industrious, persevering, watchful, determined pursuers of profit; not given to idle speculations, nor distracted by attending to various subjects, but filled full of one idea—that of employing capital so as to obtain the greatest possible return for it. The former, the men of the house of commons, are fanciful theorists, or wild Irish, or dandies, or prodigals harassed by debts, or Nimrods, or clod-hopping persons, without even one idea, mixed up with some clever men who would make excellent jugglers—but how many are practical and safe men? That such an assembly should mismanage business, so as to inflict all kinds of injury on the country, is not surprising. Except in cases where corruption makes them act in a particular way, they treat the affairs of the nation just as they treat their own affairs. The industry, knowledge, and capability which they bring to the consideration of their own concerns, being very little, and they being incapable of bringing more than they possess of these qualities to the consider-

ation of public concerns, it cannot be a matter of wonder that they behave as they do. But why do such persons become legislators? Because there is an extravagant expenditure. The systematized profusion of the government holds out temptations to men of all kinds to inflict their presence upon the great council of the nation, with almost a certainty of benefit to themselves, and with an absolute certainty of injury to every body else. The prodigality then, the dearness of the government, is the mother of all the evils springing from careless, ignorant, and venal legislation. Who can describe or even number them? The millions who suffer from antiquated institutions may answer, if they can. The agricultural labourer, who has become half peasant and half slave, from the operation of the corn and the poor-laws, can show his wasted body. The over-worked and under-fed artizan in manufacturing towns, has often told his tale of wretchedness. The voice of barbarous Ireland, hungry in the midst of plenty, has long ago been choked in blood. The struggle is vain, and the fight is hopeless, whilst the base lucre of gain is a loadstone to the house of commons, attracting all who have sense enough to know that having something is better than having nothing.

The correctness of this estimate of the lower house of parliament, will be proved by a cursory review of the proceedings, during the session which has just ended. During that period, the great defect of the reformed house, already noticed, its not being a deliberative assembly, has been prominent on every occasion. The only rule of action has been confidence, blind confidence in the ministry. Proofs of the existence of this principle were seen in the general tone and behaviour of our reformed legislators, in every measure decided upon, and in the mass of business postponed in compliance with the desires of the government. During the whole of the session, a disinclination even to hear any but ministerial speakers, was remarkable; to which was added, an extraordinary readiness to believe in the promises of the ministers, at all times and upon all subjects.'

The parliament, then, placing implicit faith in the government, represents not the nation, but the cabinet. To determine the character of the house, it is only necessary to observe that of the ministry. By what tenure does the ministry hold office? Not by the good-will of the people—on that side they are safe; placed in safety by the blind confidence of the commons—not by the pleasure of the king; for it is well understood that they would have resigned, more than once, without the forbearance of the tory house of lords—but by adopting measures not too unpleasing to this same tory house of lords. The ministers hold office during pleasure—whose pleasure? that of the house of lords. The measures of the government must be suited to the atmosphere of the chamber of peers, or the hold of the whigs on office could not be retained for a month. The guiding principle of the cabinet, therefore is, not to offend the house of lords over-much; not to displease those who were the proprietors of rotten boroughs. Thus the chief pressure on the ministry comes from the tory faction, so that if this state of things were to last, we should have a tory government, notwithstanding reform. Facts are not wanting to show, that we have such a government now. The ministry have turned a deaf

ear to the general demand for effectual law reform, and for the removal of impediments to the diffusion of knowledge. A cry for cheap and speedy justice, by means of local courts, and for unstamped papers, that must have obtained its object at the hands of a ministry acting in the sense of the people, has been raised in vain. Viewing the subject in this light, it would appear better to have a cabinet composed of tories. They could retain power by only one method, by not displeasing the nation; so that in that case, we might have a government liberal in reality, though illiberal in name; in that case the house of commons would assert its power; would really govern, no matter by what instruments. At present the government is composed of liberal instruments, moved by a tory power. The wheels of the state-machine are whig—the steam is tory. Thus, blind confidence in the whigs has ended in submission to the tories. Reversing this order of cause and effect, we see that the tory faction, in the house of peers, still possesses the power to turn out a cabinet, and therefore the cabinet must conciliate the tories. We must have a government suffered by an oligarchy, from whose dominion reform was meant to have set us free, or be without a government. In order not to be without a government, the house of commons places confidence in the ministry, and, through them, submits to the tories. But what is the original cause of this series of immediate causes producing a tory government in spite of reform? It is that great public purse into which the tories yet hope to put their hands once more; it is the motives to resistance to all improvement furnished to the tories by the vast expenditure, which they long to administer, and which they cannot but see, would become less and less worth administering, as real reform should proceed.' pp. 208—217.

And then follows an attack upon Lord Grey, in the spirit of the Black Book and the True Sun. There is no mistaking the spirit and the drift of all this invective; and its tendency is only to strengthen a feeling which the Author represents as procuring supporters for the ministry,—'fear of the ignorant or bad men 'who set up for leaders of the people, of Cobbett and such like.' We cannot consider Mr. Wakefield as an ignorant man, although the volume shews him to be more knowing than wise; nor have we any right or wish to impugn his motives. But we cannot understand upon what grounds he affects to hold himself so far aloof from 'Cobbett and others of the same stamp,' as being so immeasurably their superior in illumination and political principle. We should have supposed him to be a politician very much of their 'stamp.'

That there is a good deal of truth in the Author's political satire, is indisputable: still it *is* satire, and not a fair representation of the fact. That the present House of Commons has shewn any disposition to be meanly subservient to Ministers, is at utter variance with fact. The true explanation of any apparent vacillation or facile compliance, is very different from this.

No doubt, the dread of bringing back the Tories, has had its influence on the minds of many members; and with others, an equal disgust with the Radicals may repel in a contrary direction. And really, nothing can be more disgusting than to see the Radical party coalescing with the Tories on all occasions, echoing their slanders of the Whigs, and joining in their contemptuous abuse of a Reformed Parliament. This is, obviously, in many instances, the vindictive language of disappointed ambition or mortified vanity. There is, however, so much left that demands reform, in our institutions and in the doings of our legislators, that such publications as the present are not to be contemned; for truth, let it come in what shape and from what quarter it may, will always revenge itself on those by whom it is despised. Radicalism will never become formidable till reform stops, and till the people, finding themselves betrayed by their guardians, become mad enough to avenge upon themselves the crimes and follies of their rulers.

---

Art. VI.—*A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Winchester, in October, 1833.* By Charles Richard Sumner, D.D., Bishop of Winchester, Prelate of the most noble Order of the Garter. 8vo. pp. 84. London, 1834.

THAT will be a happy state of things which shall present no temptation to one sect of Protestants to contemn the ministry, or to seek to underrate the numbers and importance of another. A singular controversy has recently sprung up between Episcopilians of the Establishment and Dissenters, of a purely statistical character. The latter have been charged with exaggerating their numerical force: whereas the truth is, that they had not been aware of it, and their attention was first directed to the subject by their political enemies. When they heard it continually iterated, that the Reform-bill, the abolition of slavery, and other great national measures had been carried chiefly by the Dissenters, that to the Dissenters the present Administration owed much of their strength, that the Dissenters were become so formidable a party,—and all these things were said by their opponents, with a view to alarm and rouse the Tory party into more strenuous hostility to reform in Church and State,—it was inevitable that Dissenters should begin to awake to a consciousness of their numerical importance, as well as of their moral strength. Hitherto, the returns they have obtained, have far exceeded all their previous calculations; and when these shall be completed, they will prove that never was there a title more inapplicable than that which is assumed by the endowed Episcopal order, of 'the National Church'.

' The theory of our National Church supposes ', says the Bishop of Winchester, in his present Charge, ' that all who have ' the desire should be admitted to worship, and that provision ' should be made for their religious instruction, public as well as ' private, within her pale.

' Such at least is the *ideal system* on which this part of our ecclesiastical constitution is based ; and I scruple not to say, that a system more beautifully adapted for producing the greatest amount of practical good, the wit of man never devised, or the blessing of God ratified with the Divine sanction. How much, however, under the present circumstances of our thickly peopled community, facts are at variance with the theoretical principle, unhappily needs no demonstration.' p. 16.

The adaptation of an ideal system to produce practical good, seems to us somewhat hypothetical ; but the Bishop virtually admits, that the theoretical principle of the Established Church *has failed*. Its beautiful adaptation has then been disproved. Facts have demonstrated that the ecclesiastical constitution founded upon such ideal system, was *not* adapted to provide for the wants of the population. And why has it failed ? First, because in no country has an order of secular clergy, maintained by endowments, been found to answer to the character, and adequately to discharge the functions of *popular* instructors. Accordingly, in Roman Catholic countries, the efficient instructors of the people have been the regular orders ; and when the Reformation extinguished these, it left a chasm between the Church and the people, which was never supplied till it was filled up by the Dissenters. The curate system might have come in aid, if its direct tendency were not to convert the superior clergy into pluralists and sinecurists.

But secondly, the ' ideal system ' failed, because, either through ignorance or improvidence, it made no provision for the increase of the population. The parochial system was framed with such exclusive reference to the emoluments of the incumbent and the prerogatives of the patron, as to place the greatest difficulties in the way of increasing the provision for the religious instruction of the people. Then, again, it failed, because it expressly prohibited the people from making any provision for their own spiritual wants. And finally, because the Church has always proudly and intolerancey declined the aid of all voluntary labourers of other Protestant communions, whose services she might have found valuable as those of allies, if she had not preferred to treat them as insurgents and traitors.

Such is the *beautiful* system which the Bishop considers so happily adapted, in theory, to produce benefits which have never been realized. Its beauty is assuredly that of architecture, not that of mechanism ;—of form, not of life. It is like the costly

beauty of a pompous aqueduct, which looks well in the landscape, even in decay, but which owes its erection to ignorance of the first principles of hydraulics. Such is the Church Establishment! Its admirers are now looking up with profound reverence to its Gothic arches, and trying to repair its broken cisterns, while Dissenters have been laying on their pipes, and unobtrusively conveying the living water, at small expense, to every part of the land.

Nothing can more strikingly shew the opposite character of the two systems, than the fact, that the very increase of the population, from which the institutions of voluntary piety and benevolence derive their vigour, is to the Establishment a source of weakness and a subject of alarm. A source of political weakness at the same time that it has been a cause of pecuniary aggrandizement; for the increasing wealth of the Church has only separated it more and more widely from the growing population. The state of many large parishes, for which the Establishment *theoretically* provides, and for *which it has forbidden any other provision to be made*, is thus depicted by the pious Bishop.

'The parish presents the melancholy picture of a moral waste, instead of a Christian brotherhood. There is no sympathy or bond of holy union between pastor and people; the very relationship is despised and disowned; motives are suspected, confidence is withdrawn, respect is violated, and alienation and enmity take the place of veneration and love. These, indeed, are trite complaints; but they must be reiterated without ceasing, until a remedy be applied to alleviate so pernicious an evil. Daily experience manifests but too plainly, that *it is sapping, with fearful certainty, the foundations of our national temple*. And though the recent Act of Parliament (1 and 2 Will. IV. c. 38) has removed some of the obstructions which have so long impeded the erection of additional churches, and the planting of new ministries, throughout the length and breadth of the country, there needs a greater effort than has yet been made, to meet the emergency.' p. 18.

But are not these very obstructions part and parcel of the 'beautiful system'? The more enlightened friends of the Establishment may regret that 'temporal and peculiar rights should 'have been allowed to exist over parishes'; and may try to father the evil upon Pope Innocent. But it matters not where it originated; it has existed ever since the Protestant Church as by law established has had an existence, and will continue to exist so long as it is an Establishment. It is an integral part of the system. The Church has created the very obstructions of which she complains; and now she is pettishly blaming the people for breeding faster than it has suited her to provide for them spiritual (i. e. ecclesiastical) accommodation.

The state of things within the Bishop's own jurisdiction is thus given. The counties of Southampton and Surrey, comprised in the diocese of Winchester, (exclusive of 11 parishes in the latter

county belonging to the peculiar jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury,) contain a population, according to the census of 1831, of 728,077 souls, viz.

	Places of worship belonging to the Establishment.
In Hampshire.....	314,313
Surrey .....	413,764 *
	<hr/> 728,077
	327
	159
	<hr/> 486

In Hampshire, the population has increased 11 per cent. within the preceding ten years; and in Surrey, 22 per cent. The places of Episcopal worship are 25 more than reported at the last visitation. Of these 486, only 231 are endowed with great tithes, either in whole or in part; so that, remarks his Lordship, 'the ministries of more than half the clergy in the diocese are without that ancient right of provision, on which the *temporal* foundations of our ecclesiastical house may be said to have been laid.' Of the impropriations, 137 belong to laymen, and the remainder are the property of colleges or of clerical corporations. Of the 327 places of worship in Hampshire, 5, and of 159 in Surrey, 12, are proprietary chapels. The ecclesiastical patronage of the two counties is thus distributed:—

In the gift of the Crown .....	34
— Bishops and other ecclesiastics ...	114
— Laymen .....	248
— Ecclesiastical Corporations.....	34
— Lay Corporations .....	3
Colleges .....	53
	<hr/> 486

Of the officiating ministers, 323 are incumbents, of whom 42 are pluralists; and 204 are curates, 11 of whom are pluralists of a different kind, not as holding more than one *living*, but as having each the charge of two churches. The number of parishes without resident clergy 'either incumbents or curates', is 70; but 41 of these are chapelries where the clergy of the mother churches are resident. The number of parishes *without resident incumbents is not stated*. The total number of officiating ministers is 527, which gives an average of 1 to about 1,380 souls, on the aggregate population. But so unequally is this provision distributed, that the Southwark parishes, which cover about 600 acres, have a population of about 91,500, and only 9 parochial ministers; Lambeth, with about 90,000 inhabitants, has 11 clergy with cure of souls; and Portsea has 42,000, with 4 parochial clergy. Deducting the population of these three places

\* Total population of Surrey, including the 11 peculiars, 486,326.

from the aggregate population of the diocese, we have 505,000 souls with 503 officiating clergy, while, for a population of 223,000, the Establishment provides only 24 ministers. This assuredly presents a fresh illustration of the beautiful system ! According to this statement, in the excepted parishes, the average provision is 1 to every 9000 ; in the rest of the diocese, 1 to 1000 !

Of the aggregate population, his Lordship thinks, that 'less than *three-fourteenths*, on an average, may probably be calculated as Dissenters'. That is, not a fourth of the population ! Let us then see what provision the Dissenters have made for the wants of the population. In the two counties, the number of Dissenting and Roman Catholic places of worship was estimated in 1829 as follows \* :—

	Roman Catholic.	Protestant.	Total.
Hampshire.....	11	117	128
Surrey .....	4	97	101
	15	214	229

Since 1829, the number has been considerably increased ; so that, according to his Lordship's shewing, *three-fourteenths of the population provide nearly or quite one-half as many places of worship as the Establishment itself*.

Again, taking the population of the two counties at 800,640, three-fourteenths will be 171,560. We may perhaps strike off 3,560 as Roman Catholics, which will leave 168,000 Dissenters with 214 places of worship ; that is, 1 to every 785 of the Dissenting population, spontaneously provided and supported at the cost of the worshippers ; while the Establishment, with all its tithes, glebes, and patronage, provides for the other eleven-fourteenths only 486 places of worship, and in some places only 1 minister to every 9,000 souls. Is it then just, is it decent, that the three-fourteenths who provide a third of the total number of places of worship, with their ministers, at their own cost, should be rated and taxed for the support of the places provided for the other eleven-fourteenths ? The smaller the number of Dissenters, the more palpable is the injustice. Only consider what must be the elastic energy of Dissent, or, if the Churchman pleases, the steam power of schism, to rear and maintain a place of worship for every 785 of its population ; that is, to about every 157 families. Taking the stipend of the minister, the expenses of the place, and the money raised for schools, missionary societies, &c., at each place of Dissenting worship, at an average of only 200/-, this would be a tolerable sum to be raised by 157 families, of whom, if we may trust to the representations of Churchmen,

\* Congregational Magazine, Vol. XII. p. 689.

the far greater part are little better than paupers. But the calculation is absurd; and although Hampshire and Surrey are not counties in which the Dissenters are so numerous as in most others, the Bishop, in taking them at less than three-fourteenths, only betrays the deficiency of his information, or the strength of his prejudices. At all events, if 214 places of Dissenting worship are supposed to represent only a population of 168,000; 486 churches and chapels cannot be reasonably taken as representing more than some 400,000 souls, or seven-fourteenths; which would make the Establishment to contain actually within its pale not more than half of the population. In the rural districts, this may be even below the truth; but in the thickly-populated districts where the Establishment has provided only 1 minister to every 9,000 of the population, to speak of the Church as having even a third of the people, is absurd. The fact is, that the Establishment often crowds the agricultural districts with gentlemen-parsons, and leaves the town population very much to the sectaries. Dissenting ministers are most numerous where there is the largest population. Clergymen, on the contrary, are the most numerous where the livings are rich enough to support resident incumbents with their curates, without reference to the wants of the population. Such is the difference between the 'ideal system' of the Establishment, and the practical system which springs up wherever religion has taken root among the people!

So much for the statistics of this Episcopal Charge, to which his Lordship attaches great importance, as disclosing the true number of those over whom the influence of the clergy for good extends. They are, he adds, 'the register of our moral power.' But the value of a register depends upon its fidelity; and the accuracy of the returns upon which some of his Lordship's calculations are founded, is, we think, open to suspicion. Dissenters, however, are beginning to turn their attention to this register of their moral power; and we shall, before long, be enabled to come to more certain conclusions as to the points at issue.

'To depreciate the amount of good', says the Bishop, 'is one of the features of the present era'. We admit it; and may we be allowed to remark, that this feature cannot be more strikingly manifested, than in the attempts to depreciate the amount of good produced by the evangelical ministry of Dissenting pastors and teachers. To the Bishop of Winchester we impute no such illiberality; and although we should have been glad to find a more explicit recognition of the national importance and value of the exertions of the orthodox Nonconformists, we meet with no expressions of an offensive character. On the contrary, when his Lordship dismisses his statistics, he adopts a strain of exhortation

to his clergy worthy of a Christian bishop, and quite in harmony with what we believe to be the exemplary character of his personal conduct. It is refreshing to read, in an Episcopal Charge, such plain words of sound doctrine and faithful admonition as the following. The reader will overlook the apostolical succession.

' We are doubtless ready to abide by the apostle's conclusion,— "With us it is a very small thing that we should be judged of man's judgement." At the same time it is permitted us to seek to approve ourselves also in the world's sight, and to render our ministries acceptable in the true spirit of our message, as ministers of reconciliation and peace,—not by the preaching of an equivocal gospel—not by ministering fuel to the passions of corrupt nature—not by compromising faithfulness, or retrenching one iota from the whole counsel of truth,—but by letting our light shine brightly in the candlestick of the church—by our evident aptness to teach—by our unquestionable devotedness to every department of the ministerial work. This involves a strict scrutiny into the efficiency of our pastoral offices in promoting vital religion. Is the character of our ministrations persuasive? Are we wise to win souls? Is our net cast so as to include the greatest multitude of fishes? Has no word of intercessory prayer been wanting? Have we thought it not grievous to repeat precept upon precept, and line upon line? Have we striven to select from our quiver an arrow suited to our purpose, and been faithful in the use of every pastoral argument required by the infinite variety of cases which we are called to treat? Have we had recourse by turns to instruction, invitation, exhortation, expostulation, rebuke? Does it appear, on an honest review, that nothing has been omitted which might have made our portion of the Lord's heritage more productive? Have the public services of our churches been so regulated, as regards their number, the convenience of hours, the administration of the sacraments, the orderly and impressive performance of all parts of the several offices, as to promote edification, and to open the channels of grace to as many of our parishioners as is practicable? Have we been careful to give a salutary direction to all those aggressive movements, by which, as experience shows, a strong influence may be brought to bear upon the character of the people? Have we tried any of those expedients of District Visiting Societies, and Bible Classes, and Adult Teachings, and Cottage Readings, which are often found effective in breaking up the fallow ground, where the harvest might be plenteous were not the labourers so few? Can we take up the language of scripture, and say, "What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?" Or are there wild grapes, because we have not pruned and digged it? Has the enemy sown his tares among our wheat, because we have slept?

' It sometimes happens that, unawares, we raise obstacles ourselves which impede our usefulness. Respect and influence have now little source in prospective claims, but depend chiefly upon the formation of character. Reverence is less often paid to the man for his order's sake, than to his order for the sake of the man. While, therefore, we assert our apostolic commission, and vindicate, as need requires, and

opportunity is given, our transmitted claim, taking our stand upon that broad platform, so judiciously provided by the Church in her 23rd Article, we must be careful how we present to the world the spectacle of a personal inconsistency which defeats the weight of our argument, and practically contradicts our own pretensions. To rest upon our abstract title, however legitimate, is to mistake the temper and the requirements of the age in which we live. To little purpose shall we trace our genealogy in its lineal descent, unless it be also written 'in fleshly tables'—on the hearts of our people. Our hereditary succession must stand manifest before the world in incontrovertible evidence, to be read of all men whether friends or gainsayers—in our apostolical wisdom—our apostolical prudence—our apostolical meekness—our apostolical zeal and love.' pp. 28—31.

We must make room for the concluding paragraphs, which are truly admirable.

'I advert, lastly, and very briefly, to that which, after all, is the crowning point in the history of ministerial usefulness, that **FAITHFUL PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL WHICH SETS FORTH AND MAGNIFIES CHRIST THE LORD.** 'I, if I be lifted up,' said our Lord . . . . 'will draw all men unto me.'—'Necessity is laid upon me,' echoed the apostle; 'yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel.' In fact, all pastoral experience tends to prove the utter inefficiency of a ministry, which is not faithful in exhibiting the vital truths of the gospel. The experiment has been often tried—it has been tried upon individuals—it has been tried upon parishes—it has been tried upon whole countries, and many a conscientious pen has been constrained to write the record of its utter failure. How indeed could it be otherwise? There can be no efficacy in what has been made palatable only by adulteration. God will not honour what is not his own. He will not set his seal to a message which gives no adequate representation of his revealed will, no convincing statement of man's necessities, or of divine love. It is on the word that goes forth out of the pastor's mouth, pure and sincere, as out of the mouth of God himself, that the promised blessing rests—"It shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

'The preacher, therefore, must not be wise at the expense of his faithfulness. Essential and fundamental doctrine must not be sacrificed, to accommodate the taste, or indulge the prejudices of our people. Imperfect or clouded views of truth must not be put forth under the pretence of ministerial discretion. If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, it will not effectually warn the wicked, arouse the careless, or instruct the ignorant. Scripture must be preached scripturally. "The gospel is a mighty engine, but only mighty when God has the working of it." The affecting details of our Lord's matchless condescension and grace must be represented to the heart in all their necessary relations to the salvation of man, before the soul will be melted into repentance or quickened into love. It is only in proportion as the true word of the Lord is prophesied upon the dry bones, that "a noise" and a "shaking" are heard among them. "God, in his provi-

dence, seems to make but little account of the measures and contrivances of men, in accomplishing his designs." All our best arguments are good for nothing, unless they are founded upon the distinguished doctrines of the cross, and honour the Saviour by a faithful exhibition of his grace and love. But when Christ is exalted, and the gospel preached in its integrity and simplicity, in the spirit of a sound mind, Satan falls, 'like lightning from heaven,' and is dethroned effectually from his empire in man's heart.

Let me commend these suggestions, my reverend brethren, to your thoughtful consideration. Examine them in the balance of your own experience; and give them such weight as may fairly seem to be their due. And may " Almighty God, who has built his church upon the foundations of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone," pour down upon you " his heavenly blessing, that you may be clothed with righteousness, and that the word spoken by your mouths may have such success that it may never be spoken in vain." And may he inspire continually the universal church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord, that we may be made an holy temple, acceptable unto him, through Jesus Christ our Lord.' pp. 39—42.

Art. VII.—1. *The Sword unsheathed: the Polity of the Church of England, the Polity enforced by St. Paul, Romans xiii. 1—8.*

By J. A. Stephenson, M.A., Rector of Lympsham. 8vo. pp. 30. London, 1834.

2. *Speeches of the Rev. Joseph Coltman, M.A., Incumbent of Beverley Minster, the Rev. John Scott, Vicar of North Ferriby, and Incumbent of St. Mary's, Hull, and the Rev. John King, M.A., Incumbent of Christ's Church, Sculcoates, at a Meeting of Clergy of the Archdeaconry of the East Riding, held at Beverley, Jan. 16, 1834. With the Addresses to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, there agreed on, and other Documents.* 8vo. pp. 44. Price 1s. 6d. London, 1834.

THESE pamphlets have just come to our hand, and they deserve prompt but brief notice, as indicating the spirit of the times.

Mr. Stephenson comes forward with a sword unsheathed in one hand, and a new revelation in the other, to slay all Dissenters and put down all reformers as resisters of God's ordinance, worthy only of being mulcted in this world and damned in the next. He has discovered that St. Paul, in the xiiiith chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, 'directed his readers immediately and exclusively to ecclesiastical politics,' and that all commentators, who have hitherto supposed him to refer to civil authorities, are blockheads. St. Paul only meant, Be subordinate to your Bishop. Thus interpreted, he says,

'The passage presents not a new or diversified, it merely presents a concentrated and unrefracted light; it is only a lens, though a lens of

crystal, collecting to a focus rays every where dispersed ; a sword, but a polished one, of which the glittering surface displays the errors it pierces, and illuminates the truth it defends. A sword indeed ! A sword of the Lord ! deposited and hid in the sanctuary for 1700 years ; for during this long interval, it has not been the text, but merely the commentary wrought scabbard, that has been kept in use ; it now presents itself to view, an aboriginal—but to all practical intents and purposes a New Revelation from heaven, reserved for the crisis at which it was most needed.'

\* \* \* \* \*

'Painful as the conclusion may be, in reference to individuals, it undeniably appears that every Congregationalist, resident in a country in which the providence of God has established superior church authorities, and a system of church union with and through them, is, according to God's sentence, a resister of God's ordinance.'

'The polity of the text is no less at variance with modern Presbyterianism. The principle of Presbyterianism is spiritual aristocracy—the government of the church by co-equal presbyters, to the exclusion of individual authority, and the consequent disparagement of those possessed of it, and of Him who confers and acts by it. The principle of St. Paul is individual authority graduated and systematized—the superior dependant on the higher, the higher on the highest, the highest on the Most High. Let every soul, even the powers immediately sustained by God himself, be nevertheless subordinated to whatever powers are higher.'

'The painful but inevitable conclusion is, that every Presbyterian, resident in a country in which the providence of God has established a graduated series of individual authorities in the church, is, according to God's sentence, a resister of God's ordinance.' pp. 20—23.

We offer no comment. The fanatical insolence of this perverter of God's word, is a frightful specimen of the malignity which can veil itself under the mask of religious zeal. The Establishment that should harbour many such firebrands, could not stand : for they would soon pull it down.

We ought perhaps to apologize to Mr. Scott and his brethren for placing him in such odious company ; but the fault is not ours. These Speeches may be considered as forming, together with Mr. Scott's preface, an indirect reply to the 'coarse and violent assault' made upon the Reform party within the Church, in the last Quarterly Review. With this controversy we have nothing to do, but only to admire the peace and unity which an establishment never fails to secure among its votaries. The Reviewer and the Rector of Lympsham seem a pair ; except that the former displays more cleverness and less fanaticism. The verbal reforms for which Mr. Scott and his friends contend are moderate enough ; but in an Appendix, bolder ground is taken. Let them follow out the spirit of that paper, and we will give

them credit for acting as becomes the preachers of those doctrines which the Nonconformists were ejected for maintaining.

The following is the paper alluded to.

ASSENT AND CONSENT.

“ AMIDST all the discussions of Church Reform, there is one point which I have not seen touched, but in which, as it stands perfectly isolated and alone, it appears to me that reform might be safely and easily effected, and in which it would be far indeed from unimportant. I refer to the demand which has been made upon every clergyman holding or taking any ecclesiastical preferment since the celebrated St. Bartholomew’s Day, in the year 1662, publicly to declare his “unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer,” &c. The imposing of this declaration, we know, turned 2000 clergymen out of their livings in the first instance—many of them men of the highest character; inconceivably strengthened the hands of dissent; and inflicted a blow on the Church, which she has never to this day recovered. It has subsequently kept many worthy men, who might have been ornaments and blessings to the establishment, from entering her ministry; and some who have entered it, from ever proceeding beyond the station of curates: to my knowledge, it has been very burdensome to the consciences of many who have yet, upon the whole, thought themselves warranted in complying with it: and it is a constant subject of taunt and reproach against us in the mouths of our adversaries, who represent us as *sworn to the full approval*, as well as consenting to the *use*, of “all and every thing contained and prescribed in and by” any part of the Book of Common Prayer.

“ And where is the *necessity*, I would ask, and what is the *benefit*, of requiring such a sweeping declaration as this? We did without it from the Reformation to the Restoration; and, if all other securities failed of preventing the convulsion of “the great rebellion” which intervened, no one, surely, will pretend that this additional engagement on the part of the clergy, had it existed, would have averted that catastrophe.—Independently of this declaration, we subscribe, both at ordination and on admission to a benefice, the three articles contained in the thirty-sixth canon, one of which declares, “that the Book of Common Prayer . . . . containeth in it nothing contrary to the Word of God, and that it may be lawfully used, and that we will use it:” and, on the latter occasion, both before the bishop, and in the church to the congregation, we promise that we “will conform to the Liturgy of the Church of England as it is now by law established.” Surely all this is sufficient without the form in question; which is so drawn as if designedly to embarrass the conscience, and to expose us to the attacks of our enemies. In fact, whoever will read the account of its imposition in Burnet, (anno 1662, in two distinct places,) must feel the conviction forced upon him, that the whole proceeding was extremely harsh and unwarrantable: and the only ground on which compliance with the form was, or I think can be justified, is, that, contrary to the apparent meaning of the words, the Act itself explains it to be a declaration of “assent

and consent to the use," rather than to the *approval* of "all things." To demand this entire APPROBATION of "all and every thing" contained in a volume of no inconsiderable size, comprising matters ritual, liturgical, doctrinal, and we might add, political also, would be (if I may coin such a word) a very *unprotestant* proceeding indeed: and even with the explanation thus given, (which I believe to be good and valid as far as it goes,) the exaction is such as Elizabeth, in all the plenitude of her power, never, that I am aware, thought of: we owe it entirely to the reign of Charles II.—Let us be restored, in this respect, to the state in which things were in the days of our Jewels, and Hookers, and Halls, and a great relief will be given to many individuals, and no inconsiderable advantage conferred on our Church, in this her day of conflict."

---

### ART. VIII.—LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

An Attempt to discriminate the Styles of Architecture in England; with Notices of above Three Thousand Edifices. By Thomas Rickman, Architect, F.S. A. Fourth Edition,

Preparing for immediate publication, in one volume post 8vo., Poems on Sacred Subjects. By Maria Grace Saffery, of Salisbury.

Education Reform; or the Necessity and Practicability of a Comprehensive System of National Education. By Thomas Wyse, jun. Esq., late M.P. for the County of Tipperary.

The Rev. J. B. Innes, of Norwich, is preparing, and will speedily publish, a Reply to the Rev. William Hull's Pamphlet on "Ecclesiastical Establishments."

In the press, A New Edition, with Corrections and Additions, of Italy. By Josiah Conder. In three volumes.

Nearly ready for the press, A Memoir of the Life, Character, and Writings of Sir Matthew Hale, knt., Lord Chief Justice of England. By J. B. Williams, Esq., LL.D., F.S.A.

It is not generally known that Mrs. Siddons left by will to Thomas Campbell (Author of the *Pleasures of Hope*) all her Diaries and Memoranda, for the express purpose of writing her Life, upon which the Poet has been engaged ever since her decease. He has just completed his interesting task, and the work may be expected to be through the press in the course of the ensuing month.

In the press, *The Short-hand Standard, attempted by an Analysis of the Circle.* By Thomas Moat. 8vo.

In a few days will be published, "Religion essential to the National Welfare," a Sermon preached at Silver Street Chapel, Feb. 6, 1834, before the Monthly Association of Congregational Ministers and Churches. By John Pye Smith, D.D.

The First Monthly Part of a new and important work on Natural History, by Henry Woods, F.Z.S. A.L.S., which has been nearly seven years in preparation, is announced to appear on the 31st of March. It will combine scientific arrangement with copious detail, and form a complete concentration of all that is at present known of the entire class *Mammalia*, embracing the latest discoveries, and including an accurate account of the physiology, habits, locality, &c. of every recognized existing species, including the fossils. The illustrations, which are chiefly portraits of the animals themselves, drawn from nature, expressly for the work, by Harvey, will exceed 500 in number, besides a great variety of osteological and fossil figures, from the drawings of the author; and the entire work will be completed in thirty Monthly Parts.

The Rev. Dr. J. S. Memes, of Edinburgh, has just completed a Life of Cowper, to which will be added the whole of Cowper's Poems and Letters, thus rendering it the most complete edition that has ever appeared. The whole to be comprised in three vols. post 8vo., to be published monthly, and embellished with portraits.

Mr. Holman, the celebrated Blind Traveller, has nearly ready for publication the first volume of his Voyage round the World, including Travels in Africa, Asia, Australasia, America, &c. &c. The first portion of the work will contain Madeira, Teneriffe, St. Jago, Sierra Leone, Cape Coast, Accra, Fernando Po, Bonny, Calabar and other Rivers in the Bight of Biafra, Princes Island, Ascension, Rio Janeiro, and Journey to the Gold Mines.

Mr. Sillery, the Author of "Vallery, or the Citadel of the Lake," &c. has just completed his new Work, entitled *The Royal Mariner*, giving an Historical Sketch of the Naval Scenes in which his present Majesty bore an honourable and conspicuous part. The volume is embellished with a Portrait of the King, and a very beautiful vignette view of the Battle off Cape St. Vincent.

The third Fasciculus of the New Journal of Medico-Chirurgical Knowledge, has just arrived from Paris, and will be published on the 5th instant. This Number contains a beautifully finished plate of the Fold of the Arm, with valuable Contributions by several of the most eminent Professors of Medicine on the Continent.

The numerous interesting Plates intended to illustrate Mr. Walker's valuable new Work—"Physiognomy founded on Physiology," being now completed, the volume will be published early in March. It will afford amusement as well as instruction in the critical examination of physiognomical and national character—placing the subject on a far more satisfactory basis than has ever yet been attained: the Phrenologists as well as the Antiquarians, will be interested in reading an appended paper on the skulls of Ancient Britons and Romans at Hythe.

A volume, containing vivid portraiture of the more prominent personages who figured in the first struggles of the Reformers, more especially at the French Court, will shortly appear, under the title of *Catherine de Medicis, or the Rival Faiths.*

Sir Thomas Dick Lauder has just completed the second volume of his excellent Miscellany of Natural History, containing thirty-six beautifully coloured plates of the Feline Species, from the Noble Lion to the Domestic Cat, the whole drawn by Mr. A. Forbes, A.S.A., and engraved by Mr. Kidd, S.A., with descriptive letter-press by William Rhind, Esq., M.R.C.S., &c., enriched with a great variety of highly interesting Anecdotes, and a more complete account of this singular Species than has ever before been given to the public.

---

## ART. IX. WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

### HISTORY.

The Cabinet Annual Register, and Historical, Political, Biographical, and Miscellaneous Chronicle of 1833. Price 7s. 6d. cloth, or 10s. 6d. morocco.

delivered before the Monthly Association of Congregational Ministers and Churches. By Rev. J. Robinson. 8vo., 1s. 6d.

### THEOLOGY.

The Unity of the Church; a Sermon

Hall's (Robert) Sermon on Modern Infidelity. 8vo., 1s. 6d. boards, or 2s. 6d. silk.